# The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus

# Supplements to Novum Testamentum

*Executive Editors*

M.M. Mitchell
Chicago

D.P. Moessner
Dubuque



VOLUME 123

# The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus

*by*

Outi Lehtipuu

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Lehtipuu, Outi.
The afterlife imagery in Luke's story of the rich man and Lazarus / by Outi Lehtipuu.
p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732; v. 123)
Revision of the author's thesis (doctoral)—University of Helsinki, 2004.
Includes bibliographical references (p. and index).
ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15301-1
ISBN-10: 90-04-15301-2 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Bible. N.T. Luke XVI, 19–31—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Rich man and Lazarus (Parable)—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 3. Future life—Biblical teaching. I. Title.

BT378.D5L44 2007
226.8'06—dc22

2006049211

ISSN 0167-9732
ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15301 1
ISBN-10: 90 04 15301 2



PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For my children

# CONTENTS

PART IV

AFTERLIFE IMAGERY IN LUKE-ACTS

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is a slightly revised version of my doctoral dissertation accepted by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Helsinki at the very end of 2004. The work would never have been completed without the assistance and guidance of a number of people whom I especially wish to acknowledge.

Heikki Räisänen has acted as my supervisor from the beginning of my research. His remarks on my work, always justified and always stimulating, have been invaluable. He has constantly infused me with courage, not least when I myself was uncertain which would happen first, the completion of my manuscript or the birth of my youngest child.

Adela Yarbro Collins (Yale University) acted as the official examiner in the public defense of the dissertation. Her acute remarks and well-founded suggestions before, at, and after the defense helped me to sharpen my ideas on many points. Her profound knowledge and genuine interest in her students have impressed me ever since I first met her about ten years ago in Chicago.

Lars Aejmelaeus has offered his guidance in this process from its initial stages onward, providing much encouragement as well as valuable suggestions. Risto Uro and Martti Nissinen both read most of the manuscript and gave invaluable feedback and support. Numerous other colleagues and fellow students at the Department of Biblical Studies in Helsinki have willingly shared their expertise, not only contributing to a fruitful scholarly atmosphere but also making working there fun.

I have received financial support from the Research Unit on the Formation of Early Jewish and Christian Ideology (funded by the Academy of Finland as one of its "Centres of Excellence") and from grants received from the 350th Anniversary Foundation of the University of Helsinki, the Finnish Cultural Foundation (Alli Wiherheimo Fund), the Research Institute of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, and the Department for International Relations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland. The last mentioned enabled me to spend one semester at the Lutheran School of Theology

in Chicago at the very beginning of my post-graduate studies. I am very grateful for all this support.

My special thanks are also due to Margot Stout Whiting who undertook the task of editing my English. Whatever mistakes remain are due to my own negligence. I also wish to thank Margaret Mitchell and David P. Moessner for accepting this book for publication in Novum Testamentum Supplements as well as Ivo Romein and Caroline van Erp for all their generous help.

Countless friends and relatives, all of whom I will never be able to name, have offered true friendship and encouragement all through these years. My deepest feelings of gratitude go out to my husband Olli-Pekka (Olsa) Silfverhuth with whom I have shared so much. Above all, we have shared the most precious gifts we have, our dear children Iida-Maija, Janne and Toivo. I dedicate this book to them, my most tangible hopes of an afterlife.

# NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS

Translations of the Classical texts and those of the Pseudepigrapha used in this study are specified in the footnotes. If not otherwise noted, the translations are my own.

The biblical quotations are mainly from the New Revised Standard Version (copyright © 1989 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches in the U.S.A.). The most important exception is the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31) for which I use my own translation.

# PART I

# INTRODUCTION

## CHAPTER ONE

# THE PROBLEM

In his lengthy treatise against Marcion, Tertullian refutes Marcion's way of reading the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus in Luke 16:19–31 and, instead, gives his own view concerning the nature of the otherworld:

> I suppose, hell is one thing, Abraham's bosom quite another. For it says that between those regions a great gulf intervenes and prevents passage from either side to the other. Moreover the rich man could not have lifted up his eyes, even from a great distance, except towards things higher, even from the far abyss through that immense distance of height and depth. Hence it becomes plain to any wise man who has ever heard of the Elysian fields, that there is a sort of distinct locality referred to as Abraham's bosom, for the reception of the souls [. . .] So I affirm that that region, Abraham's bosom, though not in heaven, yet not so deep as hell, will in the meanwhile afford refreshment to the souls of the righteous, until the consummation of all things makes complete the general resurrection with its fullness of reward (*Marc.* 4,34,11–14).[1]

Tertullian's understanding of the otherworldly realm is but one example of the profound impact the afterlife description in the Rich Man and Lazarus has had on later Christian thought. Indeed, it seems that it is expressly the afterlife scene with consolation for the righteous, fiery torments for the wicked, and an insurmountable gulf in between that is the remembered part of the story and that has had the strongest influence of all.[2] The story has served as the necessary

---

[1] Translation by Evans.

[2] Cf. Bovon's survey of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the story; *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 126–30. Almost all the later references to the story that he cites concentrate on the otherworldly fate. This is not to deny the influence of other features of the story, especially its teaching concerning the rich and the poor. For example, Albert Schweitzer cited the story in explaining why he abandoned his theological career, became a doctor and founded the Lambaréné Hospital in French Equatorial Africa (modern-day Gabon); see *Zwischen Wasser und Urwald*, 5 and *Denken und Tat*, 59; cf. Gilmour, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 288–89; Kreitzer, "Luke 16:19–31," 141–42. The sores of the poor man Lazarus were early on interpreted as signs of leprosy and thus Lazarus has given his name to a leper-house or hospital in several languages: lazaretto (English), Lazarett (German), lazaret (French), lazzaretto (Italian),

scriptural authority for imagining what the fate of the dead is like.[3] Like Tertullian, many other subsequent thinkers have also construed the Hades of Luke's story as an intermediate state, giving a strong impetus to the rise of the belief in purgatory.[4]

For centuries, the devout imagination created detailed descriptions of the different rewards and torments that awaited the good and the ungodly respectively. For example, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, a widely circulated writing from the early second century, states that the sinners will be cast to eternal darkness and fire where terrifying torments await them according to the sin committed (*Apoc. Pet.* 7–12 in the Ethiopic version).[5] After the detailed description of hell, the text has much less to say about the joys of the eternal kingdom where the righteous will arrive. Several other early Christian writings also contain similar depictions of hell and heaven.[6] This tradition can be seen as culminating in Dante's *Divine Commedy* with its descriptions of a multi-layered hell, purgatory and heaven.[7]

However, modern research has taken a totally different stand on the afterlife scene in the Rich Man and Lazarus. Most commentators emphasize that the purpose of the story is not to reveal anything about the conditions of the afterlife, it is ". . . not a Baedeker's

lázareto (Spanish), lazareto (Portuguese), lasarett (Swedish), lasaretti (Finnish); cf. Kremer, *Lukasevangelium*, 167. Moreover, the pauper seems to have transmitted his supposed leprosy to his resurrected namesake (cf. John 11) and many of these hospitals were dedicated to the Lazarus of Bethany. In many medieval sermons, it is not clear which Lazarus is actually referred to, see Bériou, "Les lépreux sous le regard des prédicateurs d'après les collections de sermons ad status du XIII[ème] siècle," 35–36 and 65, n. 89.

[3] See Bernstein, *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds*, 326–27.

[4] LeGoff, *La naissance du purgatoire*, 98–102, 133–37, 232–33, 379.

[5] The numerous known citations of *Apoc. Pet.* show that it was read both in east and west. For example, Clement of Alexandria regarded it as part of the Holy Scriptures (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 6,14,1); see Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha 2*, 622; Bauckham, "The Apocalypse of Peter: An Account of Research," 4739–41.

[6] E.g., *Acts of Thomas* 55–57; *Christian Sibyllines* 2,252–310; *Apocalypse of Paul* 31–42. For a detailed discusson of several early Jewish and Christian descriptions of hell, see Himmelfarb's book *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature.*

[7] It is well known that the most important source of Dante's inspiration was Virgil's *Aeneid*. Dante himself never alludes to Luke's story and probably did not consciously think of it. However, as we shall see, the story draws from a common, traditional worldview reflected in Virgil's account as well as in many other Greek, Roman and Jewish descriptions of the otherworld.

guide to the next world."[8] An illustration of the scholarly stance is that of N.T. Wright:

> The parable is not, as often supposed, a description of the afterlife, warning people to be sure of their ultimate destination. If that were its point, it would not be a parable: a story about someone getting lost in London would not be a *parable* if addressed to people attempting to find their way through that city without a map.[9]

The reluctance of scholars to fully explore the afterlife imagery in the story is probably due to several factors, not least the desire to break away from the whole idea of eternal punishment, which seems problematic and unjustified to the present-day reader.[10] Another factor causing embarrassment is the presumed reason for the reversal: Are the poor really rewarded for their poverty and the rich likewise punished only for their wealth?[11] Surely this cannot correspond to the way Jesus envisioned the otherworld, can it?[12]

These embarrassments have been overcome by pointing to extra-biblical parallels, which are assumed to prove that the description of the afterworld corresponds to popular thinking and has no inherent value of its own. Most commentators have eagerly referred to a certain Egyptian folktale (see below pp. 12–14), which not only attests the folkloric nature of the afterlife imagery but also gives an explicit reason for the reversal. The teller of the story, either Jesus or Luke,

---

[8] Gilmour, *Luke*, 290. Similarly, e.g., Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 623; Plummer, *The Gospel according to S. Luke*, 393; Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, 185; Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 173; Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, 427; Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke*, 201–202; Wehrli, "Luke 16:19–31," 277.

[9] Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God*, 255.

[10] In his novel *The Last Temptation of Christ*, N. Kazantzakis uses artistic license to give another ending to the story: "When Lazarus heard Abraham's words he sighed and addressed God in his mind: 'God, how can anyone be happy in Paradise when he knows that there is a man—a soul—roasting for all eternity? Refresh him, Lord, that I may be refreshed. Deliver him, Lord that I may be delivered. Otherwise I too shall begin to feel the flames.' God heard his thought and was glad. 'Lazarus, beloved,' he said, 'go down; take the thirster by the hand. My fountains are inexhaustible. Bring him here so that he may drink and refresh himself, and you refresh yourself with him.' [. . .] 'For all eternity?' asked Lazarus. 'Yes, for all eternity,' God replied." (Trans. P.A. Bien, p. 202.)

[11] See, e.g., Plummer who flatly denies any traces of "Ebionite heresy" in the story; S. *Luke*, 390.

[12] Cf. Powyss, *"Hell": A Hard Look at a Hard Question*, 218–28. In his view, Jesus did not threaten the wicked with eternal punishment. The Rich Man and Lazarus tells nothing about the fate of the dead; it is "a chilling rhetorical attack on Pharisaic piety and hope" not "a window on the afterlife."

could rely on the fact that the audience knew the folktale and was able to apply its moral to the story.[13] Thus Joachim Jeremias claims in his influential work on the parables of Jesus:[14]

> According to the wording of v. 25 it might appear as though the doctrine of retribution which is here expounded is of purely external application (on earth, wealth, in the life beyond, torment; on earth, poverty, in the next life, refreshment). But, quite apart from the contradiction in the context (vv. 14f.), where has Jesus ever suggested that wealth in itself merits hell, and that poverty in itself is rewarded by paradise? What v. 25 really says is that impiety and lovelessness are punished, and that piety and humility are rewarded; this is clearly shown by comparison with the folk-material made use of by Jesus. [. . .] Since the first part is drawn from well-known folk-material, the emphasis lies on the new 'epilogue' which Jesus added to the first part. Like all the other double-edged parables, this one also has its stress on the second point. That means that Jesus does not want to comment on a social problem, nor does he intend to give teaching about the after-life, but he relates the parable to warn men who resemble the brothers of the rich man of the impending danger.[15]

The observation that the point of the story lies elsewhere than in the revelation of the afterlife is, of course, absolutely correct. Its focus is on the reversal of fate of the rich man and the poor man and on the call to repentance according to "Moses and the prophets." It is not intended as a cosmological description or an apocalypse of otherworldly secrets; the afterlife scene only provides a setting for the story. Yet the fate of the dead *is* revealed. The reversal of fate of the rich man and the poor man in the afterlife is a vital part of the message of repentance and thus central to the story. The horrifying fate of the rich man is intended as a serious threat for those who stay unrepentant.[16] From this I infer that the way in which the

[13] Cf. Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus: Greco-Roman Backgrounds to Luke 16,19–31," 449.

[14] His monograph on parables, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, was first published in 1947 and thoroughly revised in its sixth edition in 1962. The citation is from the second revised edition of the English translation *The Parables of Jesus* (1972).

[15] *Parables*, 185–86.

[16] For this reason I do not find Wright's analogy between Luke's story and "a story about someone getting lost in London" (cf. p. 5 above) very accurate. Wright seems to overemphasize the parabolic nature of the Rich Man and Lazarus. According to the classical definition by Jülicher, the story is *not* a parable proper but an "illustration story" or an "example" without a metaphoric element. Despite the deep-rooted scholarly tradition of calling the Rich Man and Lazarus a parable, in this work I refer to it as an "example story" or simply a "story."

execution of the penalty is described is also intended to be taken seriously.

Many scholars are of a different opinion. For example, Robert Maddox comments:

> It is no more necessary to believe that Luke took this eschatological description literally than it is to believe that every modern Christian who tells or retells a story about Saint Peter as gate-keeper of 'the pearly gates' has seriously conflated Rev. 21:10ff. with Matt. 16:19 to produce the eschatology which he really holds.[17]

There is no definite answer to the question of whether Luke took this description literally or not. Certainly the ancients were capable of conceiving symbols and using symbolic language—not least concerning such non-empiric realm as the world of the dead. This kind of speculation is, however, not relevant to the present discussion. What is relevant is that Luke wanted his audience to take the description seriously and made use of beliefs that were culturally acceptable.[18] The description tells more about the culture of the time than about the recesses of Luke's mind.[19]

There are several good reasons to claim that Luke did want his audience to take the description seriously. First of all, there is not a slightest hint in the story to the contrary but, the opposite, the two men are depicted in a realistic fashion.[20] This is typical of many stories in Luke's gospel. Many details in the description of the two men, the clothing and lifestyle of the rich man, the sores of the poor man and the dogs licking them, etc., give the fictional story an illusion of concrete reality.[21] When the scene changes from this world to the hereafter, it is more difficult to maintain the credibility of the story. Instead of depicting the men and their condition at length, the credibility is maintained by changing the narrative into a dialogue.[22]

---

[17] Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, 103.

[18] Cf. Johnston, *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, 6; Sourvinou-Inwood, *"Reading" Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*, 10–12.

[19] Cf. Martin, *Inventing Superstition: From the Hippocratics to the Christians*, 107.

[20] This intention has been carried out so well that many early commentators actually thought that Lazarus was in actuality a poor man Jesus met in Jerusalem, not a character in a story told by Jesus. Cf. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 167.

[21] Cf. Syreeni, "The Gospel in Paradigms: A Study in the Hermeneutical Space of Luke-Acts," 53.

[22] Lehtipuu, "Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and the Poor Man in Luke 16.19–31," 92.

Certainly, the scene in the afterworld is also meant to be taken seriously. The details of the scene do not contain ironic, comical or exaggerating features as in some ancient parodies.[23] The fate in the hereafter is real.

Secondly, the afterlife scene in the story fits well into its contemporary overall worldview. Bliss for the pious and punishments for the wicked in the world to come are standard features in many Hellenistic eschatological accounts. Thus, the conditions described in the story do not reflect any idiosyncratic fantasies but rather current beliefs. It is another question whether these ideas suit the twenty-first century mind.

Thirdly, what should we think of Luke as a writer if we assumed that he included in his work traditions which did not at all correspond to his own thinking? If the afterlife scene in the story had contradicted Luke's own way of thinking, he could have easily altered it, especially as the conditions of the afterworld are not a central part of the story. I fully share the currently common opinion that the gospel writers were authors, not just compilers of traditional material. If Luke was a conscious author, then he has deliberately chosen to present the afterworld in the way it is depicted in the story.

Thus, the afterlife scene in the story should not be dismissed too lightly—either as only reflecting popular belief or as a piece of imagination[24]—as the majority of scholars have so often done. On the other hand, the story is—a story. It has another point than revealing the fate of the individual after death. Some scholars tend to overemphasize the significance of the story in this respect. Typically, those scholars who focus on Luke's eschatology often picture Luke's view as a coherent system where different pieces of information gathered from his double work fit seamlessly together. Indicative of this is A.J. Mattill's assessment:

> Luke [. . .] could conceivably have mixed apocalyptic and Hellenistic eschatologies, perhaps being oblivious to the intellectual difficulties involved. If so, Luke was not the first nor the last who failed to work out a consistent eschatology. But the overall impression of a coherent

---

[23] Such as the Aristophanes' *Frogs* or the many works of Lucian of Samosata, e.g., *Dial. mort.*, *Cat.*, *Men.* (10–15), *Luct.* (2–9), *Ver.hist. 2* (5–27).

[24] Cf. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*, 66, n. 100.

> eschatology which one gets from the first page to the last of Luke's two volumes is such as to warn against a too facile acceptance of such inconsistency on Luke's part.[25]

One of the pieces that must be fitted into this coherent system is the afterlife scene in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The solution of most scholars who advocate this view is that the story describes an intermediate state between the death of the two men and future judgment and resurrection. In fact, this schematization comes quite close to the endeavor of Tertullian to harmonize the different biblical views (quoted above on p. 3). However, it may be questioned—and will be questioned in the course of this study—whether the coherence of the eschatological image is what counts in Luke's story or whether it serves the real point Luke wants to make.

These two different scholarly stances give the starting point for this study. I argue that the afterlife scene in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus must not be underestimated as a reflection of popular belief with no significance of its own. On the other hand, it should not be overestimated as a vital part of Luke's eschatological doctrine. The first step in this argumentation is to give an overview of the scholarly tradition on the story, especially the widely held opinion of the significance of an Egyptian parallel for understanding the story. In the same connection I clarify my own position in this scholarly field.

---

[25] Mattill, *Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought*, 40.

CHAPTER TWO

# PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND ITS EVALUATION

Earlier scholarship on the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus has largely concentrated on three questions. The first concerns its unity, the second its extra-biblical parallels, and the third its authenticity. These questions, posed for the first time at the end of the nineteenth century, have dominated the field ever since.[1] As a result, the scholarly tradition can be described, as Ronald Hock does, as ". . . unusually stable, uniform, and, one might almost say, self-satisfied."[2] This is especially true concerning the proposition that an Egyptian folktale lies behind the story and offers a sufficient background for understanding it.

## 2.1. The Legacy of Jülicher and Gressmann

The all-time classic of parable research, Adolf Jülicher's *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, was published in two parts in 1886 and 1899.[3] According to Jülicher, the afterlife scene in the story reflected popular notions (*Volksvorstellung*) and did not correspond to Jesus' thinking. Jesus and his disciples had no need to change or improve the story at this point as the story was not told in order to give new revelation of the otherworld.[4] The point of the story was to show, as in the Beatitudes and Woes, that misery and poverty on earth is the better lot since it will be rewarded in the age to come while earthly pleasures will lead to damnation.[5] Jülicher suggested that the story was made of two only loosely connected parts. The first part consisted of vv. 19–26, the second of vv. 27–31.[6] Only the first part derived from Jesus. The latter part was a secondary, but pre-Lukan addition. The story Luke found in his source consisted of both parts

[1] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 451.
[2] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 447.
[3] The 1899 edition contained both parts together, the first part in a revised form.
[4] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 623.
[5] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 635, 638.
[6] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 634.

and the evangelist adopted the whole without making appreciable changes.[7]

Jülicher did not specify what he meant by the "popular notions" on which the afterlife scene was based. This was done by Hugo Gressmann in his influential study *Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus: eine literargeschichtliche Studie*, published in 1918. There he introduced an Egyptian folktale that told about the reversal of fate of a rich man and a poor man after death.[8] According to Gressmann, this folktale was a descendant of a lost Egyptian tale which was also known in Jewish circles.[9] Jesus made use of this well-known story in the first part of the story to which he added a new ending (vv. 27–31). Thus the story must be understood as a unity: in the latter part, which formed the real point of the story, Jesus wanted to protest against the belief that it is possible to receive knowledge of one's postmortem fate by miraculous messages from the otherworld. According to Jesus, Moses and the prophets make God's will sufficiently clear.[10]

The Egyptian tale, extant in a single Demotic version,[11] is about Setne Khamwas,[12] the high priest of Ptah at Memphis and his son

[7] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 634, 638–39.

[8] The story was first published as a transliteration and two translations (one literary, another word-for-word) by Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis: The Sethon of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas*, 41–66, 142–207. A more recent English translation is found in Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Reading 3*, 138–51. This translation will be used here. A German translation (by G. Möller) is included in Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus: eine literargeschichtliche Studie*, 63–68. A partly paraphrastic French translation is in G. Maspero, "Contes relatifs aux grands prètres de Memphis," 474–90 and *Le contes populaires de l'Égypte Ancienne*, 130–55. Maspero was also the first one to note the relationship of the Demotic story to the Lukan story, as acknowledged by Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann* 31; cf. "Contes relatifs," 496.

[9] The description of the reversal of fate forms only a part of a much longer narrative. As the reversal story is quite distinct from the rest of the narrative, Gressmann rightly concluded that the reversal story had formerly existed independently in folklore and was only secondarily attached to the extant story; *Vom reichen Mann*, 31–32.

[10] Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann*, 56–59.

[11] The Demotic text is written on a *verso* of a papyrus (British Museum Papyrus no. 604) containing two Greek business documents, one of which is dated to the seventh year of Claudius (46/7 C.E.); Griffith, *Stories*, 41. The writing of the tale is dated to the second century C.E. but the tale itself is likely to be much older.

[12] Setne Khamwas is a historical figure, a son of Ramses II, who lived in the thirteenth century B.C.E. He was remembered as a learned sage and a powerful magician, traits also manifest in the Demotic stories about him. We know of two separate stories, commonly called Setne I and Setne II; Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature 3*, 125. The story in question here is Setne II.

Si-Osire who is the true hero of the story.[13] One day the father and the son see two funerals. A rich man is buried with great honors and loud lamenting while a poor man is taken out of the city wrapped in a mat, with no escorts and mourners. The scene makes Setne declare the rich man to be much happier than the poor man. The son, however, wishes that his father's fate in the netherworld would be similar to that of the poor man. To demonstrate his wish, Si-Osire takes his father to the realm of the dead, *Amente*[14] where they apparently see seven halls.[15] In the fourth and fifth hall, they see people who are punished. There are people who plait ropes, while donkeys chew them up. Others try to reach their provisions of water and bread hung above them but cannot as other people are digging pits at their feet to prevent them.

According to Si-Osire's explanation, they are people who are punished by repeating their earthly fortune in the netherworld. Those plaiting ropes are people who "... labor night and day for their livelihood, while their women rob them behind their backs, and they find no bread to eat." Those trying to reach for water and bread are "... the kind of people on earth who have their life[16] before them while the god digs a pit under their feet, to prevent them from finding it." They also see the rich man among the punished. He is pleading and lamenting loudly because he has the pivot of the door of the hall fixed in his eye. In the sixth and seventh hall, they see the gods and the judgment. There is a scale before the gods and they weigh the good deeds against the misdeeds. Those whose misdeeds

[13] The name has the meaning "the son of Osiris;" Griffith, *Stories*, 43. In the story, Si-Osire is actually a divine child, the reincarnated great magician Horus-son-of-Paneshe, born miraculously to a childless couple, Setne and his wife Mehusekhe. The real point of the story is to tell how this divine figure, at the age of twelve, challenges and conquers a mighty Nubian sorcerer, after which he returns back to where he came from. The part of the tale which tells about the reversal of fortune in the afterlife is relatively distinct from the rest of the story.

[14] Literally "West" as the abode of the dead was imagined there where the sun sets. The name Amente is used both for the realm of the dead and its personification, "the Goddess of the West;" Zandee, *Death as an Enemy: According to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions*, 91–92.

[15] The manuscript is damaged at this point. Thirteen lines are so fragmentary that it is impossible to reconstruct their content. According to Griffith, Setne seems to be troubled at Si-Osire's wish and some dialogue follows. After that, there must be some kind of description of their entrance to the netherworld and its three first halls; *Stories*, 45.

[16] According to Lichtheim, probably "livelihood," rather than "life," is intended; *Ancient Egyptian Literature 3*, 141, n. 3.

exceed their good deeds are punished but those whose good deeds exceed their misdeeds are taken in among the gods. The poor man is in an honorary place near Osiris, clothed in the rich man's funeral garment of royal linen. The moral of the story is: "He who is beneficent on earth, to him one is beneficent in the netherworld. And he who is evil, to him one is evil."

According to Gressmann, the Jews of Alexandria brought the tale to Palestine[17] where it was repeated in several variations in rabbinic teaching.[18] The earliest one of these is found in the Palestinian Talmud in two practically identical versions[19] (*ySanh.* 6:6 23c, 30–41.42–43//*yHag.* 2:2 77d,42–54.54–57) that tell about two Torah scholars[20] and a tax-collector, Bar-Ma'yan.[21] One scholar dies unmourned, without due respect proportionate to his piety, but the whole town ceases from working in order to bury the tax-collector. The other scholar grieves over the injustice of the funerals but is consoled by a dream. In it, the deceased scholar explains that his cursory burial was a punishment for the only sin he had committed in his life and likewise, the splendid burial of the tax-collector was a reward for his only good deed in life. The sin of the scholar was that once he bound the phylactery of the head before that of the hand.[22] The only good deed of the tax-collector was to invite the poor of the town to enjoy the meal he had arranged for the town councilors who did not come.[23] According to some, once the tax-collector let a poor man pick up and keep a loaf of bread that had fallen from under his arm. As the funerals thus compensate for

[17] Gressman, *Vom reichen Mann*, 20, 46.

[18] The different rabbinic versions were first collected by Chaim M. Horowitz in 1890; see Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann*, 8. All these versions are included both in their original language (Hebrew or Aramaic) and in a German translation in Gressmann's study, pp. 70–86 (texts A–G).

[19] There are some minor differences between the versions, see notes 20 and 21 below. In his English translation of the Palestinian Talmud, Neusner gives an identical version of both texts. The differences are shown in the German translation by Wewers.

[20] Instead of scholars, the version in the Hagigah refers to them as holy men. According to both versions, the men ate, drank and studied the Scriptures together.

[21] Or, according to the Hagigah, "the son of the tax-collector Ma'yan".

[22] This is the wrong order as attested in *yMSh.* 56c,43–46.

[23] The apparent correspondence between this account and the parable of the great banquet (Lk 14:16–24//Mt 22:1–10) convinced Jeremias that Jesus was familiar with the Jewish story and utilized a part of it in two of his parables; *Gleichnisse* 178, 182. There is, however, no reason to assume any straight dependency. Both features are common motifs that probably circulated widely.

the only sin and the only good deed, the scholar may enjoy pure bliss in the otherworld, in a wonderful garden with trees and a spring of water, while the tax-collector suffers unrelieved pain. He is on a riverbank where he tries in vain to reach the water with his tongue. According to Gressmann, the rabbinic versions clearly derive from the same Egyptian original as Luke's story but they must be considered secondary to it.[24] The similarities between Luke's story and the rabbinic ones are explained by their common origin.[25]

The impact of Gressmann's theory on later scholarship is astounding. One of his early critics, however, was Rudolf Bultmann who was not convinced of the usefulness of the Egyptian parallel. In his seminal work *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, first published in 1921, Bultmann made the remark that the Egyptian and Jewish stories have a different point from Luke's story. Whereas the former defend divine justice and show that reward and punishment in the afterworld correspond to piety and sin, the Lukan story simply uses the reversal of earthly fortune in the world to come as a warning to the rich and a consolation for the poor. Moreover, Luke does not include the different burial of the rich man and the poor man in his story.[26] Instead, Bultmann introduced a Jewish legend from which Luke's story, according to his view, probably derived. This legend tells—"in a very fairy-story, fantasy manner"—of a rich and godless couple.[27] In their courtyard, there is a gate leading to hell. Despite continuous warnings, the woman opens it and is dragged inside. The desperate husband starts searching for his wife and meets a giant who offers to accompany him to hell to see the wife. The

[24] The Jewish versions of the reversal of fate after death are also quite loosely connected with their wider context. The story of the two men forms a part of a longer discussion on whether Simeon b. Shatah was patriarch (instead of Judah b. Tabbai). The story of the death of the two men is told in support of Simeon's being patriarch. After seeing the vision of the blessedness of his fellow-scholar and the torment of the tax-collector, the other scholar also sees a certain Miriam being punished. She has the pin of the gate of Gehenna fixed in her ear. The scholar learns that she will suffer until Simeon b. Shatah will come; then the pin of the gate will be removed from her ear and set in his. This is because Simeon had vowed that, if he is made patriarch, he will kill off all the witches of Ascalon which he had not done. The scholar tells his dream to Simeon who repents and hangs all eighty witches.

[25] Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann*, 53–54.

[26] Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 221.

[27] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 212–13. The story was first published with a French translation by Lévi, "Un receuil des contes Juifs inédits," 76–81. A German translation is, e.g., in binGorion, *Born Judas 2*, 60–64.

husband does not have the courage but sends a servant boy instead. The boy finds the wife in great pain. She sits in fire and must quench her thirst with melted lead. This is because of her many sins. She has been an adulteress, she has violated the Sabbath, she has had intercourse with her husband while menstruating (!), and she has not pitied the poor and the orphans. No one can release her from her sufferings since she does not have a son who could pray for her. The wife gives the boy her ring and a message for the husband: "Abandon your evil deeds, for the power of repentance is great." The husband is deeply moved, repents and is let into heaven.

Bultmann admitted that the legend in its present form is relatively recent but considered it improbable that it derived from the gospel story. This made him posit an alternative suggestion: a Jewish story (perhaps also of a man called Lazarus), reminiscent of the surviving legend, lies behind Luke 16:19–31.[28] The conclusion of Luke's story, which originally told of a message from the world of the dead, had undergone a polemical change and was provided with a point that completely destroyed the original unity of the story. In its present form, the story has two points: vv. 19–26 are meant to console the poor and warn the rich by telling how earthly fortunes will be balanced in the world to come; vv. 27–31 declare that Moses and the prophets have made God's will sufficiently clear and a return of a dead person will add nothing to this.[29]

Thus Bultmann stayed on the same track as Jülicher in seeing the story as consisting of two separate parts. According to Bultmann, the points of each part compete with each other, since the first part does not prepare the way for the second. The story, however, is pre-Lukan in its entirety[30] but neither part goes back to Jesus or the early church. The central point of the story, the uselessness of asking God for a miracle as a confirmation of his will since all that is necessary is in Moses and the prophets, is thoroughly Jewish. Similar ideals occur in other Jewish texts, such as Deut 30:11–14 and the last chapters of *1 Enoch*. Thus Bultmann concluded that the story was originally a Jewish tale put into the mouth of Jesus.[31]

---

[28] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 213.

[29] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 193, 212.

[30] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 193. In his view, v. 14 is a Lukan composition which prepares the way for both points of the story. The following verses serve as introduction to the story, v. 15 for the first part, vv. 16–18 for the second.

[31] Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 220. For criticism against Bultmann's view, see Crossan, *In Parables*, 65–66; Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*, 142.

Both Bultmann's and Gressmann's suggestions concerning the background to Luke's story can be seen in retrospect as overoptimistic attempts to find a clear extra-biblical parallel for a given New Testament text. It is interesting, however, that while Bultmann's parallel has been severely criticized and unanimously abandoned,[32] Gressmann's parallel has been approved and it has gained an overwhelmingly strong position in the research on this story. A closer examination also reveals that Gressmann's original position has been somewhat simplified in later scholarship. Whereas Gressmann himself did not assume straight dependency on the Demotic tale but postulated a common origin, many subsequent scholars simply refer to the story of Setne and Si-Osire as a parallel that adequately illuminates the obscurities of Luke's story.

Most studies on the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus have pursued a similar approach. Many scholars accept the division of the story into two parts.[33] Differences are greater concerning the authenticity of the story, even though the majority would consider the first part to be an authentic teaching of Jesus.[34] The idea of the story deriving from an extra-biblical tale has received the widest acceptance of all: Gressmann's hypothesis has truly gained an extraordinary

[32] See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, 340; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 1127.

[33] See the list in Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 449, n. 5. Others who build their interpretation of the story on the division include, e.g., Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 340; Obermüller, "La miseria de un rico: un juicio neotestamentario—Lucas 16,19–31," 48; Feuillet, "La parabole de mauvais riche et du pauvre Lazare (Lc 16,19–31) antithèse de la parabole de l'intendant astucieux (Lc 16,1–9)," 216; Nikolainen, *Luukkaan evankeliumi*, 283–84; Kremer, *Lukasevangelium*, 166; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary*, 634; Scott, *Hear Then*, 145–46; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 615; Hintzen, *Verkündigung und Wahrnehmung: über das Verhältnis von Evangelium und Leser am Beispiel Lk 16,19–31*, 347–51. For an opposite view, see Wiefel, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 298; Schnider & Stenger, "Die offene Tür und die unüberschreitbare Kluft: strukturanalytische Überlegungen zum Gleichnis vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus," 273–76.

[34] One example of the discussion on the authenticity is offered in the report of the so-called Jesus Seminar; see Funk & Scott & Butts, *The Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition*, 64 and 100–106. According to the vote of the seminar, which consisted of approximately one hundred New Testament scholars, the latter part (vv. 27–31) was nearly unanimously deemed secondary while the vote concerning the first part (vv. 19–26) was divided in the following manner: 4% regarded it unquestionably as an authentic teaching of Jesus, 46% were likely to ascribe it to Jesus, 21% considered its teaching to come close to what Jesus taught, and 29% deemed it part of later tradition. On the other hand, several scholars regard the whole story as authentic, see Wehrli, *Lukas*, 276; Nikolainen, *Luukkaan evankeliumi*, 284; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1127–28; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*, 116.

position in the scholarly tradition.[35] The only slight variation seems to be that some scholars emphasize the significance of the Demotic tale and its likeness to Luke's story, others consider the rabbinic story a more relevant parallel, while further scholars regard both equally significant. In any case, the adoption of Gressmann's proposal has seemed to solve the problem concerning the afterlife scene in the story. If the scene derives from an imported folktale, there is no need to pay any serious attention to it.

## 2.2. The Key Issues in More Recent Research

These three questions still dominate the overall discussion on the Rich Man and Lazarus,[36] even though, in recent years, the traditional questions have given way to new approaches that concentrate solely on the textual level of the story.[37] Thus, in order to clarify my own position, I will briefly evaluate the discussion on all these points, although my own focus is on the last question concerning the cultural background of the story.

[35] Hock gives an impressive list of scholars who accept the folktale as lying behind the story; "Lazarus and Micyllus," 449, n. 7. Others could have been added. These include, e.g., Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke*, 297; Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels 2: St. Luke and St. Matthew*, 96; Cadbury, "A Proper Name for Dives," 401; Glombitza, "Der reiche Mann und der arme Lazarus Luk 16,19–31," 166–67; Schneider, *Lukas*, 340; Wehrli, "Luke," 276; Obermüller, "Miseria," 64; Gilmour, *Luke*, 289; Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 170; Maddox, *Purpose*, 49; Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospe: A Study in Early Christian Historiographyl*, 161 and *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*, 150–51. In addition, several studies more recent than Hock's article still promote the Gressmann hypothesis, e.g., Berger & Colpe, *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 141–43; Berger, *Im Anfang war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums*, 42.206; Kremer, *Lukasevangelium*, 166; Carroll, *Response*, 65; Reinmuth, "Ps.-Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 33,1–5 und die Auslegung der Parabel Lk 16,19–31" 28; Stein, *Luke*, 422; Griffiths, *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgment in the Ancient Religions*, 277 and "Cross-Cultural Eschatology with Dives and Lazarus," 8–9; Wright, *Victory of God*, 255; Powyss, *Hell*, 218.

[36] An example of this is the treatment of the story in Bovon's commentary on Luke, published in 2001. See *Lukas 3*, 109–17.

[37] See Schnider & Stenger, "Offene Tür," 273–76. According to them, a synchronic analysis must always precede the diachronic one. In their synchronic analysis, they divide the story into three scenes: vv. 19–21, vv. 22–23 and vv. 24–31. See also the structural reading of Güttgemanns, "Narrative Analyse synoptischer Texte," 67 and the semiotic analysis of Jensen, "Diesseits und Jenseits des Raumes eines Textes," 41–60. Hintzen also gives priority to the synchronic approach; *Verkündigung*, 19–20. However, as part of his synchronic analysis he pays attention

### *A Story Composed of Two Parts?*

There are several arguments that defend the original disunity of the story. First, the latter part (vv. 27–31) has little connection with the first part (vv. 19–26).[38] As the story proceeds, its direction and focus change: the rich man becomes the principal character while the poor man is hardly mentioned.[39] Secondly, the story of the reversal is in itself a coherent whole; it does not need the latter part to be comprehensible.[40] Thirdly, the two parts draw from different traditions and only the first part has a parallel in Egyptian (and Jewish) folklore.

These arguments, however, cannot be counted as very weighty. To see the two parts as unrelated to each other is clearly an exaggeration. The latter part answers the question raised by the first, namely, whether it is possible to avoid the fate of the rich man. For the rich man, this information comes too late, so other people, the five brothers, must be introduced.[41] The difficulty with the second argument (the first part forms a coherent whole) is that there is no unanimous view where this "coherent whole" ends. The most common solution is either after v. 25 or v. 26.[42] However, the first part would be a comprehensible unity even if it ended after v. 23.[43] Thus

to the semantic field of the expressions found in the text and seeks for their earlier usage. There he also discusses the Gressmann parallels, but considers only the Jewish variants significant, and these only as far as the burial and the messenger from the world of the dead are concerned (pp. 215 and 230).

[38] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 638.

[39] According to Jeremias, a more fitting name for the story would be "the parable of the six brothers;" *Gleichnisse*, 186. Other scholars also emphasize the role of the rich man as the key figure of the story, see, e.g., Grobel, ". . . Whose Name Was Neves," 373; Feuillet, "Mauvais riche," 216.

[40] See Scott, according to whom "when Abraham acknowledges the great chasm, formally the narrative comes to a conclusion, for it has exhausted its possibilities." *Hear Then*, 146.

[41] *Contra* Brown who points out that, in contrast to the Prodigal Son, there is no preparation in the first part of the Rich Man and Lazarus for the latter part, as the five brothers appear from nowhere. Brown, *The Gospel according to John I*, 429.

[42] Jülicher presumed that the original story ends at v. 25. According to him, v. 26 is an editorial bridge uniting the two parts; *Gleichnisreden*, 634. Likewise, e.g., Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 472–73 and Obermüller, "Miseria," 48–49. Others, however, assume that v. 26 also belongs to the original story; e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1126–27; Feuillet, "Mauvais riche," 216; Schneider, *Lukas*, 340; Wehrli, "Luke 16:19–31," 276; Kremer, *Lukasevangelium*, 166; Crossan, *In Parables*, 65–66; Scott, *Hear Then*, 141.

[43] The only scholar to my knowledge to have suggested this solution is Jeremias but this was not his original view. Originally he made the division between vv. 26 and 27 but in the seventh edition of *Gleichnisse Jesu* (1965) he counted only vv. 19–23

it seems that the beginning of the story does not form such an unambiguous whole that can be easily separated from the rest of the story.[44] The third argument is likewise problematic. It rests on the outdated view that traditions are fixed entities which are borrowed more or less unchanged.[45] This, however, is seldom the case. No matter what the traditions behind the story, the storyteller is not obliged to keep to them but may elaborate and expand the traditional material.

The question of disunity can be reversed and it may be asked why the story should be divided into two parts. Does it contain such tensions that cannot be otherwise solved than by supposing that the latter part is a later addition? The only such feature in the story is the shift from the juxtaposition of the two men to the rich man and his brothers. In this respect, it resembles another Lukan example story, that of the Prodigal Son (Lk 15:11–32). Its unity has also been questioned. The description of the fate and the return of the prodigal (vv. 11–24) changes into a dialogue between the father and the older son (vv. 25–32). In that story, too, the protagonist of the first part practically disappears from the second part. The prodigal becomes the subject of the dialogue between the father and the elder son in a similar way to the poor man in the Rich Man and Lazarus. Yet the Prodigal Son must be understood as an original whole: if the second part were only an addition, there would have been no need to begin the story with the mention of *two* sons.[46] Even though there are no such clear markers of unity in the Rich Man and Lazarus, there are no serious objections against its unity, either.

The conviction that the Rich Man and Lazarus is composed of two originally separate parts seems to rest on Jülicher's influential thesis that each parable has only one point. The longer the parable, the harder it is to reduce it to a single point.[47] For instance, the

as the original story and all of vv. 24–31 as a later addition (cf. p. 95 in the 1947 edition and p. 185 in the 1984 edition). The English versions that follow the revised German edition of 1962 still repeat the division 19–26 and 27–31.

[44] The Prodigal Son, another example story that supposedly has been extended by an appendix, is different in this respect: the dividing line between the original story and the secondary ending is always drawn between vv. 24 and 25.

[45] I return to this in more detail in chap. 4.

[46] See Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*, 163–64; Räisänen, "The Prodigal Gentile and His Jewish Christian Brother Lk 15,11–32," 1628–29.

[47] Cf. Bultmann who argues for the disunity because there are two incompatible points in the story; *Geschichte*, 193.

second half of the Prodigal Son seems to be superfluous if the sole point of the story is the father's love. And vice versa: there is no need of such a detailed description of the younger son, his prodigality and return if the point is only to teach those resembling the elder brother (Jewish Christians?) to accept their prodigal brothers (gentile Christians?)[48] Clearly, both God's unconditional love and brotherly acceptance are involved. Both points are closely connected; the Prodigal Son may be seen as an illustration of the saying of Jesus in Luke 6:36: "Be merciful just as your Father is merciful." Similarly, the Rich Man and Lazarus also has more than one point. First there is the eschatological reversal of the rich man and the poor man, then the exhortation to repentance. Both parts are intertwined: the reversal paves the way for the warning, i.e., this will happen if you do not repent and share your possessions while you still have time.

Another reason for the alleged disunity is the observation that the latter part, especially vv. 30–31 that speak of disbelief in resurrection, seem to reflect a post-Easter situation.[49] This is, in my view, convincing as such, but the claim speaks for the disunity only if the first part is attributed to Jesus, something which cannot be assumed *a priori*. This leads us to the second major discussion, that concerning the authenticity of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

---

[48] Such a reading is suggested by Räisänen, "Prodigal," 1624–27; cf. J.T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts*, 198. According to Räisänen, the story can be read on two levels. On the first level, the lost son stands for the tax-collectors and sinners of vv. 1–2 and the elder brother the Pharisees. On the second level, the elder brother stands for conservative Jewish-Christians and the prodigal converted Gentiles. Both readings are typological but a reading without any allegorical features is not possible if the father is identified with God as the context clearly requires. Drury has shown that allegory is not so strange to New Testament parables as has long been maintained (since Jülicher). Concerning the Prodigal Son, Drury states: "The father stands for God, the older son is orthodox unreconstructed Judaism, and the prodigal who has put himself beyond the orthodox Jewish pale by his fornicating and swineherding is typical of the sinners and Gentiles who were welcome to Luke's Church. Each of the main characters in the tale has an allegorical connection with the wider history of Jewish unresponsiveness and the readiness of sinners and Gentiles. It is not absolutely necessary to getting the story's point but belongs in the richness of its full contextual meaning;" *Parables*, 117. Elsewhere Luke also uses parables to illustrate God's qualities, e.g., in 11:5–8 and 18:1–8.

[49] Crossan, *In Parables*, 65–66. According to him, "there are too many links between this discussion of "resurrection" of the rich man and that concerning Jesus' own resurrection in Luke 24 to be coincidence." Crossan considers the ending as pre-Lukan. Scott, who elaborates Crossan's argumentation, comes to the conclusion

### *An Original Teaching of Jesus?*

According to the famous opening lines in Jeremias' *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*, "The student of the parables of Jesus, as they have been transmitted to us in the first three Gospels, may be confident that he stands upon a particularly firm historical foundation. The parables are a fragment of the original rock of tradition."[50] Even though Jeremias' work has received severe criticism from more recent scholars[51] and the results of orality studies have cast a serious doubt over the concept of *ipsissima verba Jesu*, many scholars maintain the classic view that the majority of the parables (or at least a core of them)[52] go back to Jesus.[53]

Such a view is maintained, e.g., by John Dominic Crossan for whom the parables form an important basis for the quest for the message of Jesus.[54] According to Crossan, all the parables of Jesus

---

that "Luke has at least rewritten or reshaped the conclusion of the parable to fit his apologetic needs;" *Hear Then*, 142–45.

[50] Jeremias, *Parables*, 11. Jeremias did not contest Jülicher's claim that the parables had undergone reinterpretation in the transmission process (see *Gleichnisreden I*, 203–322); the express task of the scholar was, according to his view, to uncover their original meaning under the "thick layer of dust" produced by the allegorizing of the originally "simple" and "clear" parables, a task left only half-done by Jülicher. However, Jeremias was confident that the original meaning could be found.

[51] The rise of redaction criticism directed scholarly attention to the distinctive features of the parables in different gospels and emphasized the role of each evangelist in shaping and even forming some of them. See Goulder, "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels," 66–69; E.P. Sanders & Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 174–86.

[52] See, e.g., Scott, *Hear Then*, 63; Boomershine, "Jesus of Nazareth and the Watersheds of Ancient Orality and Literacy," 28.

[53] Most scholars are reluctant to give a precise list of Jesus' parables as the category of παραβολαί is not very easy to define and as there is no consensus on how to judge the authenticity of the parables. For example, Scott denies explicitly the authenticity of only two parables, the Wheat and Tares (Mt 13:24–30) and the Ten Virgins (Mt 25:1–13) as they "reflect exclusively the concerns of the early Christian community;" Scott, *Hear Then*, 68–72. However, he discusses only 30 parables which is far less than some other scholars do. E.g., Gerhardsson counts a total of 41 (or 42) different parables of Jesus; "Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels," 267–69; cf. "The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels," 343–44. For Drury, on the other hand, the category "parable" contains a wide range of different kinds of sayings and he comes up with a total of 80 parables in the synoptic gospels; *Parables*, 171–73. In his view, many of these must be attributed to the evangelist's creative writing; they do not go back either to Jesus or his own previous tradition.

[54] Crossan judges most synoptic parables as originating with the historical Jesus. Among these are practically all of the parables in Lukan special material. See his *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*, pp. 434–50 in Appendix I.

were originally about the Kingdom of God, concerning either the advent of the Kingdom as a gift of God, or the reversal it causes in the recipient's world, or its empowerment to life and action.[55] In the transmitting process, the original point of the parables was lost; for example, the parables of reversal were turned into paradigmatic stories that show how one should or should not behave in a certain situation.[56] One of these is the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.

It may well be that Luke has received the core of the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus from his tradition and that it reflects some reminiscence of the teaching of the historical Jesus. However, it is clear that the transmission of the Jesus tradition was a multiform process in which preserving the tradition did not exclude either its alteration and modification or developing and creating new "tradition"—both before and during the writing of the gospels. This common stand in scholarship is also taken by such a conservative scholar as Birger Gerhardsson, according to whom the Jesus tradition is preserved remarkably faithfully.[57] Even though he maintains that the parables (or "narrative meshalim," as he calls them) have in general gone through only minor alterations,[58] he does not deny the distinctiveness of different parables in each gospel. He states:

> There are number of narrative meshalim peculiar to one evangelist: one in Mark, 11 (or 10) in Matthew, 18 (or 17) in Luke.[59] The differences between these three groups of meshalim show, I think, that early Christianity has felt itself entitled to rework some of the Master's texts and even formulate new narrative meshalim, created in the spirit and style of Jesus, and also to put them in the mouth of Jesus.[60] Each of the three streams of tradition reveals even in this case a certain peculiarity. Here, the freedom of re-working (sometimes creating) seems to have

[55] Crossan, *In Parables*, 34–36.

[56] Crossan, *In Parables*, 52–76.

[57] Especially in his earlier works, Gerhardsson argues that, like all Jewish teachers, Jesus also made his disciples learn certain things by heart. This tradition was then transmitted faithfully. Variation in parallel traditions in the gospels is due first and foremost to the fact that Jesus himself delivered more than one version of his teachings; see *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, 328, 334–35. In his later publications, Gerhardsson has somewhat softened his arguments and admitted that, despite the general reliability of the Jesus tradition, the question of authenticity must be judged individually, from case to case; "Narrative Meshalim," 362–63; "Illuminating," 296–97.

[58] Gerhardsson, "Illuminating," 290.

[59] The "uncertain" case is the parable of the Talents/Pounds (Mt 25:14–30/Lk 19:11–27).

[60] According to Gerhardsson, an example of such creativity is Mt 13:51–52.

> been considerable. This especially applies to the Lukan tradition. [. . .] It is tempting to venture a guess. The longest and most "novelistic" narrative meshalim are presumably most likely to be secondary.[61]

Gerhardsson does not give any examples of these secondary parables but it is easy to define the "longest and most novelistic" parables in the Lukan tradition: the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, and the Rich Man and Lazarus.

Michael D. Goulder takes this view to another extreme. According to him, there is no tradition behind the Rich Man and Lazarus, either from Jesus or from pre-Lukan communities. The story, like all material peculiar to Luke, must be ascribed to Luke's own creative talent.[62] According to him, the story reflects Lukan style throughout and it is impossible to separate any earlier tradition from later Lukan redaction.[63] To support his view, Goulder attacks the earlier attempts to make a distinction between "tradition" and "redaction" based on linguistic criteria[64] and succeeds in convincingly showing how deceptive such criteria are.[65] Yet, his own solution falls short,

---

[61] Gerhardsson, "Illuminating," 296–97.

[62] Goulder summarizes his position (*Luke: A New Paradigm*, 22–23):

> Luke wrote his Gospel about 90 for a more Gentile church, combining Mark and Matthew. He re-wrote Matthew's birth narratives with the aid of the Old Testament, and he added new material of his own creation, largely parables, where his genius lay. The new material can almost always be understood as a Lucan development of matter in Matthew. There was hardly any L (*Sondergut*).

Other scholars who credit Luke for most of his special material include Drury, *Tradition and Design*, esp. pp. 138–71; and Enslin, "Matthew and Luke: Compilers or Authors," 2381, n. 77.

[63] Goulder, *New Paradigm*, 635–36. Cf. his comment on p. 123: "A lower-class hero is hero of the whole parable, and a succession of human, non-allegorical features, with soliloquies, etc., can only be removed from the canvas at the cost of leaving not much paint on the picture."

[64] Goulder, *New Paradigm*, 18–22, 79–86. He aims his criticism especially against Jeremias whose work, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*, has been widely influential. Jeremias based his criteria on those introduced by Rehkopf; cf. Rehkopf, *Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*, 87; Jeremias, *Sprache*, 8. However, despite the similarity of the criteria, the individual analyses yielded partly different results. Thus it is hard to avoid the conclusion that concentration on single words and expressions gives quite random overall results.

[65] Methodology also proves problematic in K. Paffenroth's attempt to define a coherent written source "L." Despite his critique of Jeremias (*The Story of Jesus According to L*, 66–67), his own reconstruction is largely based on rather similar linguistic arguments. He argues, for example, "if an L pericope contains a characteristic that Luke routinely omits in his redaction of Mark (for example, the historical present, a reference to Jesus' emotions, and so on), this will be taken as increasing

especially regarding the role of oral tradition.[66] He barely mentions the possibility and thus makes the composing of Luke's gospel a purely inter-scriptural affair, with Luke as a solitary artist who has retired into his chamber with only the scrolls of Mark, Matthew and the LXX as his company. This kind of view echoes the linear thinking typical of our own literary and print culture.[67] It utterly disregards the predominantly oral culture that prevailed during the time the New Testament writings were produced.[68]

Recent studies on ancient orality have made abundantly clear that the gospels were written in a predominantly oral culture.[69] Despite the existence of writing, orality prevailed and provided the standard medium of communication.[70] Literacy was limited to a small minority while most people were illiterate.[71] Even texts were produced to be read aloud.[72] Moreover, textuality was not considered a special

the likelihood that this pericope is pre-Lukan." *Story of Jesus*, 24. This raises at least two serious objections. First, if Luke altered Mark's wording and style quite freely, for instance "routinely omitting" certain characteristics, why he has not done the same with L material? The "un-Lukan" words and stylistic features do not necessarily reveal a source. Secondly, is omission of a certain characteristic from Mark always a sign of Luke's dislike of that characteristic which he would not use himself? To what extent are the changes in Markan material due to reasons other than deliberate avoidance of a certain characteristic, for instance to the desire to shorten or otherwise smooth the Markan account?

[66] Cf. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, 285, 367.

[67] Dunn speaks of "the curse of the literary paradigm;" "Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition," 309; cf. Kelber, *Oral and Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition*, 2; Dewey, "Textuality in an Oral Culture: A Survey of the Pauline Traditions," 37.

[68] An overall picture of oral tradition and its transmission in the Hellenistic and Roman periods is given by D. Aune, "Prolegomena to the Study of Oral Tradition in the Hellenistic World".

[69] It is Werner Kelber who is to be credited with directing the focus to the distinctive nature of oral traditions within New Testament scholarship in his book *The Oral and the Written Gospel* in 1983. Despite the criticism aimed mainly at his too rigid polarization between the oral and the literary, his observations concerning the overall impact of orality studies on the formation of the New Testament writings have proved to be fruitful.

[70] Achtemeier, "*Omne Verbum Sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity," 3. Orality prevailed in all European cultures all the way through the Middle Ages and was only gradually taken over by literacy. See Finnegan, *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*, 28–29. Cf. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, 119–21.

[71] Harris has estimated that the level of literacy did not much exceed 10%; *Ancient Literacy*, 329. Cf. Baines, "Literacy (ANE)," 336; Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*, 10.

[72] Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 225–26; Gamble, *Books*, 39–40.

goal[73] but more as a help to memory, an aid to oral performance.[74] The literate elite was also dependent upon oral communication and memorization.[75] Thus it is extremely unlikely that Luke, or any other New Testament writer, did not utilize oral traditions.[76]

The basic characteristics of oral tradition are its variability and creativity. There is an outline that different versions have in common but each performance tends to be more or less unique.[77] The transmission of oral tradition is a creative process. Even "preserving" old traditions from one generation to another means, in practice, changes and innovations as the performers are likely to drop some things and add others on the way.[78] This means that each version of an oral performance is authentic; it is a fresh retelling, not a new edition of an older "text."[79] Thus, it makes no sense to speak about the "correct" or "original" version of an oral tradition; there might have been several original versions.

In the light of all this, the significance of the orally transmitted Jesus tradition and its distinctiveness from literary editing should not be underestimated. Traditions were much more likely to be transmitted orally, not in writing. This indicates that it is a doubtful enterprise to try to extract an oral "source" from a given text, say, the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Even if it were based on an orally transmitted story, the story was not in a fixed form which the evangelist slavishly repeated word-for-word or only slightly altered. Oral tradition would not have forced the author to use certain types

---

[73] Andersen, "Oral Tradition," 46.

[74] Ong, *Orality*, 119; Dewey, "Textuality," 45. Reading was not an easy task as texts were written without separation of letters into words, and with no punctuation to indicate sentences and paragraphs; Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum," 10.

[75] Dewey, "Textuality," 45; Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum," 26–27. Books—or rather, scrolls—were scarce, expensive, and hard to handle. In the words of Alexander, "what was not in the memory was not readily accessible;" "Orality," 160.

[76] It is preferable to speak of "oral traditions" rather than "oral source(s)" as the latter might give an impression of something of a fixed form which is seldom the case with oral tradition. Cf. Dunn, "Jesus in Oral Memory," 293.

[77] Andersen, "Oral Tradition," 29; Abel, "The Psychology of Memory and Rumor Transmission and Their Bearing on Theories of Oral Transmission in Early Christianity," 275–7.

[78] Finnegan, *Literacy*, 57–58; Andersen, "Oral Tradition," 39.

[79] Kelber, *Oral and Written*, 30, 32–33; cf. Dunn "Jesus in Oral Memory," 296, 322; Andersen, "Oral Tradition," 51; Finnegan, *Literacy*, 69, 81. Neither the oral performer nor his or her audience can "check" tradition by consulting a written text, since it does not exist.

of expressions but freed him to reformulate and reshape it using his own words.

This freedom also extends to the treatment of written sources. Crossan speaks of "oral sensibility" for which, even in the written text, the most important thing is the basic structure, or the core of a saying, not its exact wording.[80] This resulted in considerable reformulation even in copying a written source.[81] Dunn uses the term "oral mode" to describe the same phenomenon; even when following a literary source, the evangelists incorporated the text in their own work ". . . maintaining the character of an oral retelling more than of a literary editing."[82] This means that the differences between the different synoptic versions may be first and foremost signs of the "poetic license" of the storyteller and not so much of reflected theological thinking, as redaction critical studies so often emphasize.[83]

All this puts the question of the authenticity of the Rich Man and Lazarus into new light. No matter what kind of traditions Luke may have had, the story in the written form as we now have it must be attributed to Luke himself. He has chosen the words and expressions for telling his story and shaped the points he wishes to make. This applies to all of his gospel. Obviously, in some passages he has retained the tradition quite faithfully, as synoptic comparison makes clear, in others he has allowed himself more freedom. The possibility that he created new "tradition" using some piecemeal reminiscences

---

[80] Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*, 39–40. According to him, it is thus misleading to speak about *ipsissima verba*; at most, one can speak about *ipsissima structura* of a traditional saying.

[81] According to Kelber, the reformulation means that there is no way to trace even the original core which is a fictional construct; "Jesus and Tradition," 148–51. Others are more optimistic concerning the preservation of the Jesus tradition; see Scott's response to Kelber; "Blowing in the Wind: A Response," 187–88. Also Dunn maintains (following Bailey, "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," 35–36) that the community exercises control over the ways oral traditions are preserved and further transmitted. Bailey based his arguments on the observations he made in modern day Near Eastern village life. However, this is hardly analogous to the situation of the diverse Christian communities who each carried on the process of transmission, as Uro has rightly remarked; *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas*, 122, n. 82. Moreover, the ways and situations of transmission are so varied that it is unrealistic to expect *all* tradition to be under communal control even within a single community.

[82] Dunn "Jesus in Oral Memory," 326.

[83] Naturally, these two do not have to be mutually exclusive but I wish to question the tremendous theological significance sometimes given to an alteration of just a single word or expression.

of the life of Jesus cannot be ruled out.[84] Many features in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus point in the direction that it may well represent the latter alternative. These include the numerous details that resemble those in other example stories peculiar to Luke,[85] the common structure with the other stories,[86] and the many points of contact with the rest of the gospel.[87] Regardless of the fact, then,

---

[84] An example of such creativity at work is, in my view, the story of the repentant thief on the cross. The incident does not occur in the older passion tradition where both thieves scorn Jesus. Moreover, as Syreeni puts it, "the pericope appears to be a thoroughly planned account of how everything ought to have happened in order to provide models for imitation;" "Gospel in Paradigms," 49. I treat this story in more detail in chap. 14.2.

[85] The similarities with the Prodigal Son are especially striking, such as the construction ἐπιθυμέω χορτασθῆναί linked with unclean animals, either swine or dogs (15:16; 16:21); a dialogue between a son and a father with the same address τέκνον (15:31; 16:25); seeing from a distance (μακράν, 15:20; ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, 16:23; cf. μακρόθεν ἑστώς in the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector, 18:13); a father's house with brother(s) (15:18,20; 16:27); a sumptuous party with fine clothing (described by the same verb εὐφραίνω; cf. the merrymaking of the rich fool in 12:19); and the contrast between being dead and alive/resurrected.

[86] Sellin has pointed out remarkable structural similarities in Luke's special parables such as the Two Debtors (7:41–43), the Good Samaritan (10:30–37), the Rich Fool (12:16–21), the Prodigal Son (15:11–32), the Unjust Steward (16:1–8), the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19–31), and the Pharisee and the Tax-Collector (18:10–14); "Gleichniserzähler," 180–88. They are built around a tripartite structure, a "dramatic triangle;" either there are three characters, two of whom share a common status but are contrasted by their relationship to the third character. Alternatively, there is only one person who speaks a soliloquy that reveals a problem, a sham solution, and the real, unexpected solution. Other common features of all these Lukan parables include a reversal of values and attitudes, lively, vivid characterization, close connection to their immediate context where they serve a paradigmatic function, and hortatory intention. See also Lehtipuu, "Characterization," 81–86.

[87] To name just some of the most evident ones, York has argued convincingly that the pattern of reversal is a favorite narrative device in Luke's gospel; *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*, 92–93, 160–63, 182–84. The poor and the rich, the mighty and the lowly, the insiders and the outsiders are repeatedly portrayed as contrasting pairs whose conditions are reversed or will be reversed in the future. In addition to the many parables that are built around the reversal pattern (see previous note), a reversal occurs, e.g., in the Magnificat (Lk 1:52–53) and the Beatitudes and Woes (6:20–26); cf. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes 3: Les évangélistes*, 60–62; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, 186. The Rich Man and Lazarus resembles especially the latter passage, both as far as content and vocabulary are concerned. The expression Μωϋσῆς καὶ οἱ προφῆται is also typical of Luke and he uses it in his key passages, at the end of both the gospel and Acts (Lk 24:27, 44; Acts 26:22; 28:23); cf. Syreeni, *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount: A Procedural Analysis of Matthew's Redactional Activity*, 198–99. Strikingly, in all these passages the expression is somehow connected with the motif of disbelief. This seems to indicate that Luke uses the expression very intentionally as a part of his salvation-

that Luke might have used (most probably orally transmitted) tradition, his own contribution in shaping the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus has been substantial. Thus it is more justified to speak of "Luke's story" than of "Jesus' story."

### *A Derivative of a Demotic Folktale?*

The flexible and variable nature of oral tradition also puts the long-cherished scholarly tradition concerning the Egyptian folktale in a new light.[88] Even though Gressmann did not argue for any direct dependency between the Demotic tale and Luke's story, he nonetheless viewed oral traditions as fixed entities that drifted from one place to another without considerable changes. However, it is more a question of different narrative motifs and themes that were borrowed from one culture by another and that each storyteller used in different ways and with different functions. Not even the critics of the Gressmann hypothesis have paid enough attention to this aspect. Rather they have sought other, more illuminating parallels.

Bultmann already noted the similarities between Luke's story and the last chapters of *1 Enoch*. These describe, with eschatological overtones, a fundamental conflict between the rich and the poor. The text reassures the poor that they will receive their reward while the rich will be punished at the coming judgment.[89] Unfortunately Bultmann only mentioned the connection in passing and never elaborated the idea. A more detailed comparison was pursued more than four decades later by Sverre Aalen[90] and in a more refined form by George W.E. Nickelsburg.[91] These analyses show that the last chapters

historical scheme: the law and the prophets testify to Christ, yet those listening to this testimony (i.e., Jews) do not take heed. "Listening" (ἀκούω) is another example of a theme that is constantly present in Luke-Acts (Lk 6:27,47; 8:8–15,18,21; 9:35; 10:16,39; 11:28; Acts 3:22–23; 4:19; 28:28.) "Listening" to Jesus should lead to "doing," to proper behavior. In the case of the brothers of the rich man it should lead to repentance. The term μετάνοια and the verbs διαμαρτύρομαι, μετανοέω and πείθομαι are frequently used in Luke-Acts. Especially in Acts, they become almost technical terms to depict the Christian testimony and someone's conversion (see Acts 2:38,40; 3:19; 8:25; 10:42; 11:18; 17:4,30; 18:5; 20:21,24; 23:11; 26:20; 28:23–24).

[88] See above pp. 12–18.

[89] See especially chaps. 102–104 but also the following passages: 94:6–11; 97:8–10; 98:1–3; 99:13; 100:6,10–13.

[90] His article "St Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of *1 Enoch*" appeared in 1967.

[91] See his articles "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in *1 Enoch* 92–105 and

of *1 Enoch* offer a relevant point of comparison with Luke's story. However, there seem to be greater differences between Enoch's and Luke's accounts than either Aalen or Nickelsburg realized.[92]

In his criticism of Gressmann, C.H. Cave made the promising statement that the only thing in common among the Egyptian tale, the Jewish stories, and Luke's story is the general theme, a topos in oriental storytelling, and there is no direct dependency there.[93] However, his own solution in seeking a relevant background to Luke's story in the Hebrew Bible is not satisfactory. Cave pointed to Gen 15 where both names, Abraham and Lazarus (Eliezer), appear. Abraham laments his childlessness and the fact that his servant, Eliezer of Damascus, will be his heir. In the Jewish tradition, Eliezer was considered a gentile, thus in the story Lazarus represents gentiles. The rich man, on the other hand, is Abraham's child, i.e., a Jew. Read this way, the point of the story is to teach ". . . the severity of the judgment of Israel if she persists in her unrepentant state."[94]

This reading is based on several uncertain presumptions. First, it is not clear how close a relationship the names Eliezer and Lazarus have.[95] Even if it were possible to connect the names, the Greek-speaking audience of the story would have had to have known Hebrew in order to make the connection and thus to understand the correct point. Secondly, Cave's reasoning is based on a theory of a lectionary cycle where Luke 16:19–31 was read together with Genesis 15 and Isaiah 1 at the Shabuot festival which remains hypothetic. Thirdly, Genesis 15 does not provide an analogous situation

---

the Gospel according to Luke" from 1979 and "Revisiting the Rich and the Poor in *1 Enoch* 92–105 and the Gospel according to Luke" from 1998 (reprinted in 2003).

[92] See my discussion in chap. 10.1.

[93] Cave, "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," 323. Similarly also Scott, *Hear Then*, 157; Bovon, *Lukas 3*, 113.

[94] Cave, "Lukan Deuteronomy," 323–25.

[95] According to Strack & Billerbeck, the names must be distinguished from each other. אֱלִיעֶזֶר is abbreviated לִיעֶזֶר whereas the Greek name Λάζαρος derives from לַעְזָר, a truncated form of the name אֶלְעָזָר; *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte erläutet aus Talmud und Midrash*, 223. Both names occur in the Hebrew Bible (Eliezer in Gen 15:2, Eleazar in Exod 6:23; Num 3:32, etc.) On the other hand, according to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, several rabbis were known by both names, such as the second century C.E. *tannaim* Eleazar (Eliezer) ben Zadok, Eleazar (Eliezer) ha-Kappar and Eliezer (Eleazar) ben Yose ha-Gelili. This seems to indicate that no difference was made between the names. But this is not necessarily the case as far as the truncated or Greek forms of the names are concerned.

for Luke's story as God explicitly announces concerning Eliezer: "This man shall not be your heir; no one but your very own issue shall be your heir" (Gen 15:4). In the Rich Man and Lazarus, the situation turns out to be the opposite: Lazarus (the gentile in Cave's reading) inherits the good lot in Abraham's bosom. Finally, the depiction of the Rich Man and the poor man hardly favors the interpretation that the rich man would inherit the good lot *instead of* the poor man, if he only repented. On the contrary, both the rich man and the poor man might have received a good lot.[96] In addition, the presumed scriptural background sheds no light on the question concerning the way the afterlife conditions are described.

A more recent suggestion to replace the Gressmann hypothesis with Hebrew Bible material (combined with Christian tradition) is that of Michael D. Goulder. According to him, it is "very doubtful" whether the story can be traced back to the Egyptian tale.[97] In Goulder's view, the scriptural background to the story is in Isaiah 61 (the restoration of Israel),[98] a passage that has already influenced Luke in shaping Jesus' inaugural sermon (4:18–21) and the reversal in Beatitudes and Woes (6:21–26). Here Luke combines the prophetic reversal with ". . . the alms-Mammon context in Matthew 6 with Matthew 5 behind it, and the fire-torment context in Matthew 18."[99]

It is doubtful, however, whether Isaiah 61:1–7 contains a reversal comparable to Luke's story. The prophet declares a new, joyful life for Israel; she will be restored from her shame and will receive "a double portion" (see especially v. 7) but there is no explicit mention of her enemies falling from their honorable position into shame.[100] It is also difficult to accept Goulder's theory concerning Luke's strategy in using Matthew; the combination of unattached themes in various

[96] Curiously, Sahlin offers an opposite kind of (and even less persuasive) typological reading of the story on the basis of Gen 15. According to him, the poor Lazarus (Eliezer) is a personification of the people of Israel while the rich man and his five brothers represent the rich and powerful gentile peoples; Sahlin, "Lasarusgestalten i Luk 16 och Joh 11," 168–70. These opposing views indicate that the text itself does not support a collective interpretation.
[97] Goulder, *New Paradigm*, 637.
[98] Goulder, *New Paradigm*, 634–35.
[99] Goulder, *New Paradigm*, 634.
[100] Goulder interprets the words in v. 5 "strangers shall stand and feed your flocks" to refer to "those who hitherto had oppressed Israel" (*New Paradigm*, 635) but I find no reason to see here other emphasis than that it is not Israel but strangers who work while the chosen people may enjoy the wealth of the nations.

passages appears quite haphazard. It is obvious that the warning against serving Mammon in Matthew 6:24 lies behind the Lukan story—for the simple fact that the verse appears practically *verbatim* in the context of the story, in Luke 16:13. However, it is not easy to see any real connection between the parable of the Unmerciful Servant and the Rich Man and Lazarus.[101] Goulder's reason for making the connection between the two and combining the different Matthean passages to form a background to the Rich Man and Lazarus seems to be the fact that Luke has not yet used these Matthean passages elsewhere in his gospel. However, even if Luke's using Matthew as his source were accepted, the idea that Luke chose various Matthean verses from here and there and combined them is not satisfactory.[102]

Ronald Hock provides perhaps the most severe criticism of the Gressmann hypothesis. According to him, ". . . it is best after all these years to lay the Gressmann hypothesis to rest, certainly to question its assumed utility."[103] In Hock's view, the connection between the Egyptian tale and Luke's story can—at most—be indirect.[104] This is attested by the several differences between the stories, the most important of which is the significance the folktale gives to the differences in burial between the rich man and the poor man.[105] The magnificent burial of the rich man makes Setne infer that the fate of the rich man is better than that of the poor man and the burial scene moti-

[101] According to Goulder, Luke's reading of Matthew would "suggest a parable in which the ungodly ends in the torments of hell for his lack of mercy (18.33f.), in eternal fire for his treatment of the little ones (18.7–10), for his preferring Mammon to God (6.24)." But it is hard to see why Luke had combined only these different elements of Matthew's chapters 6 and 18. Besides, in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:23–35) there is no mention of hell. In v. 34, the king sends the servant to the tormentors (παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς βασανισταῖς), i.e., to prison. Allegorically, of course, the king stands for God and the prison can be nothing but hell (even though the rest of the sentence does not fit the picture as the servant is told to be there until he pays his entire debt). Yet the eternal fire of hell is mentioned only in the warning against temptation (18:8–9).

[102] Despite Goulder's keen observations on the weaknesses of the two-source hypothesis (*New Paradigm*, 27–71; "Is Q a Juggernaut," 669–81), I do not find enough reason to give up the idea of a lost source Q. Goulder's thesis contains several problems, as pointed out by many critics; see, e.g., Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, 1–59; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*, 1–39; especially 16–31; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*, 39–41.

[103] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 454.

[104] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 452.

[105] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 452.

vates the whole tour of the underworld. In contrast, in Luke's story, the burial of the two men is not an issue; the burial of Lazarus is not mentioned at all[106] and the burial of the rich man only in passing. Moreover, the folktale does not clarify the most obscure part of the Rich Man and Lazarus, namely the reason for the reversal.[107]

For Hock, this is the most intriguing question concerning the story. In order to find an answer, he "casts the comparative net"[108] wider than often done, to the surrounding Greco-Roman world. He finds the closest parallels in the works of Lucian of Samosata, especially the *Gallus* and the *Cataplus*.[109] Both tell about a poor shoemaker, Micyllus, who is compared with (different) rich men, in the *Cataplus* with the tyrant Megapenthes. According to Hock, there are important similarities between the Lucian accounts and the Rich Man and Lazarus. These include the rhetorical comparison of rich and poor, their characterization through dialogue, and, in the case of the *Cataplus*, a similar reversal of fates after death following an attempt by the rich man to change his. Unlike Luke's story, the *Cataplus* depicts the judgment of the men and gives the criteria on which the judgment is based. The souls are judged by seeing if there are marks of evil deeds in them. The soul of the poor Micyllus is clean (as is also the soul of a Cynic philosopher at the same judgment), whereas the soul of the rich tyrant is covered with marks of murders, confiscation of property and licentiousness. Wealth gives an opportunity for immoral deeds while poverty prevents a person from doing them. Thus, the reversal is not due to wealth and poverty as such but to the moral character of the men. A similar Cynic view is seen in Luke's story: the rich man is condemned because of his hedonistic life style, the poor man is found innocent because his poverty excluded him from a similar life.[110]

These similarities are impressive and make Lucian's accounts indeed an interesting parallel to the Rich Man and Lazarus.[111] It is, however, questionable whether it is possible to use them to explain the

[106] This absence has led some commentators to think that Lazarus was left unburied. Be that as it may, the burial—or the absence of it—plays no role in Luke's story.
[107] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 452–53.
[108] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 455.
[109] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 457–62.
[110] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 462.
[111] See further the discussion in chap. 10.1.

obscurities of the story the way Hock does. Even if Lucian's satires may help to understand the overall context in which the Lukan story is rooted, it is not certain that Luke would use the similar patterns exactly the same way as Lucian, who wrote in a different century for a different audience and for a different purpose.[112] Lucian gives strong support for the claim that the reversal of fate of a rich man and a poor man after death was a known motif also in Hellenistic literature but in the interpretation of the Lukan story, it is no more illuminating than the Gressmann parallels.

Richard Bauckham suggests an alternative solution.[113] He may be credited for emphasizing the importance of the common motif instead of common details between the different stories.[114] This motif, the reversal of fate of rich and poor after death, seems to have circulated widely and there are many different kinds of stories built around it. Furthermore, the Lukan story (as well as all the proposed parallels) contains another well-known folkloric motif, namely the revelation of the fate of the dead to the living. Bauckham states:

> It is quite plausible that a version of the Egyptian and Jewish story was current in first-century Palestine and that Jesus would have known it. Thus (assuming the parable to be authentic) he could have borrowed the two motifs from it. On the other hand, he may well have known other stories which used one or both motifs. He could have known the motifs without consciously borrowing them from any one particular story. In any case, he has used them to construct a new story, which as a whole is not the same as any other extant story.[115]

Bauckham points to three different features on which both the Egyptian and the Jewish tales agree but which differ from the Lukan version.[116] First, as noted previously by both Bultmann and Hock, the burials of the men have a key role in both the Egyptian and the Jewish tales. The fate in the otherworld is contrasted with the burial of the men, not their lifestyle, as in Luke's story. Secondly, it is the observer of the burials who receives the revelation of the fate

[112] Cf. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," 5. For a critique against Hock, see Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 106–108.

[113] Bauckham's article "The Rich Man and Lazarus: the Parable and the Parallels" from 1991 has been reprinted in his collection of essays entitled *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish & Christian Apocalypses* in 1998. All my references are to the latter.

[114] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 101, 107.

[115] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 101.

[116] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 99–100.

after death.[117] In the Lukan story, in contrast, the rich man requests such a revelation but Abraham refuses it. Thirdly, the moral of the Egyptian and Jewish tales differs from Luke's story. In the former, the fate is sealed according to whether the good deeds outnumber the evil deeds or vice versa. In Luke's view, the reason is in the inequality of the earthly conditions of the two men.

Bauckham's arguments are open to some discussion[118] but they show that it is a mistake to assume any direct dependency of the story on either the Egyptian or the Jewish tales, as is so often done in scholarship. Moreover, Bauckham is right in claiming that the restriction of interest to one particular parallel and the reversal motif has overshadowed other important features in the story, for example the question of the revelation of the fate of the dead.[119] Bauckham presents several different kinds of ancient stories that make use of the latter motif. According to him, the closest parallel in this respect is offered by the Jewish or Christian writing the *Book of Jannes and Jambres*.[120] The question of how the fate of the dead is revealed to the living is closely related to the conditions of the dead in the otherworld and will be treated in detail in due course in this study.[121]

In addition to the differences pointed out by Bauckham, there are also other reasons for denying the close relationship of the Rich Man and Lazarus to the proposed parallels. One of them is the association between the two men.[122] In both the Egyptian and the Jewish story, the men just happen to die on the same day (or at least soon after one another)[123] but there is no mention of their knowing each other.[124] In Luke's story, however, the rich man and Lazarus live

---

[117] The revelation is, however, given by totally different means. The Egyptian tale depicts a tour in the otherworld whereas the fate of the dead is revealed in a dream in the Jewish stories.

[118] See my discussion concerning the refusal to reveal the otherworldly fate to the living in chap. 10.2. and concerning the reason for the reversal in chap. 9.

[119] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 101–102.

[120] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 112–14.

[121] See chap. 10.2.

[122] Seccombe, *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*, 174.

[123] The versions in the Palestinian Talmud do not indicate whether the two men were buried on the same day or not. The same day burial occurs in most of the other Jewish versions collected by Gressmann (texts B, C, D and E); *Vom reichen Mann*, 73–80.

[124] Gressmann himself acknowledged this difference. However, he assumed that, in the Egyptian original, the men did know each other since the rich man had to give his burial cloth of fine linen to this poor man in the Demotic tale. The coincidence of their burials at the same time is not a sufficient reason for this, so there

next to each other and the rich man has no difficulties recognizing Lazarus in the hereafter. Moreover, in the Jewish story, the contrasting figures are not described as rich and poor but as pious (the Torah scholar) and sinful (the tax-collector).[125]

In the last mentioned respect, then, the story more resembles the Egyptian tale where the men are likewise rich and poor. Other common features of these two stories, in which they differ from the Jewish one, include the rich man's dressing in fine linen and the honorary position of the poor man after death (near Osiris or Abraham). On the other hand, some details of Luke's story come closer to the rabbinic story. The fate of the Lukan rich man much more resembles the punishment of the tax-collector in the rabbinic story than the torment of the rich man in the Egyptian one. In the rabbinic story, the tax-collector suffers from tantalization; he stands on the riverbank but is unable to reach the water with his tongue. This resembles the rich man's request to have Lazarus sent over to cool his burning tongue with water. Instead, the punishment of the rich man in the Egyptian story, to have the pivot of the door of the hall in *Amente* fixed in his eye, has no parallel in Luke's story.[126] The means Luke uses to reveal the fate of the dead is more closely related to the Jewish story than to the Egyptian one which tells of a visit by a living person to the realm of the dead.[127] These differences, on the one hand, and the similarities on the other are easily explained if we do not presume that Luke's story is dependent on a certain fixed story. However, it is worth noting that, if such dependency is supported, one should assume that the teller of the Rich Man and Lazarus had known *both* the Egyptian and the Jewish reversal stories.

must be some relationship between them on earth. Similarly, he considered the possibility that the good deed of the tax-collector was directed towards the Torah scholar in the Jewish tale; *Vom reichen Mann*, 50–51. Both ideas remain purely speculative.

[125] Gressmann also acknowledged this difference but interpreted the scholar as being poor and the tax-collector as rich even though there is no explicit reference to the matter; *Vom reichen Mann*, 12, 44.

[126] Curiously, a similar torment is also described in the context of the rabbinic story, cf. n. 24 on p. 15 above. According to one report, Miriam is hung by the nipples of her breasts but according to another, the pivot of the gate of Gehenna is fixed in her ear. Himmelfarb suggests that this motif, too, was part of the common tradition of the Hellenistic Mediterranean world; *Tours*, 81.

[127] It is not clear, however, whether the request of the rich man to send Lazarus to his brothers implies a visit in a dream (like in the Jewish story) or a return back to life. See further chap. 10.2.

Another argument in favor of seeing the relationship between the Egyptian story and the Rich Man and Lazarus as only that of a common theme is the fact that some of the torments described in the Demotic tale are clearly of Greek origin. The traditional Egyptian view of life after death included both the idea of the absolute destruction of sinners[128] and different punishments, such as cutting and slaughtering or bondage.[129] The concept of total destruction also occurs in the story of Setne and Si-Osire where those whose evil deeds outnumber the good deeds are handed over to the Devourer.[130] Yet, the rich man and others are punished for what seems to be eternity.[131] The punishment of the rich man, to have a pivot of a door fixed in his eye, seems to be of Egyptian origin[132] but the other punishments depicted in the story, the plaiting of the ropes that are eaten by donkeys and the vain reaching for water and bread sound suspiciously Greek.[133] The latter recalls, of course, the legend of Tantalus who could not reach the water in which he stood or fruit from the trees above him (*Od.* 11,582–592). The former fate is identical to that of Ocnus (Pausanias 10,29,1; Propertius 4,3,21). He, too, was made to plait ropes in Hades but, as soon as they were completed, a she-ass next to him chewed them up. In a like manner to the Egyptian tale, this fate reflects his life on earth: he was a hard-working man but his wasteful wife scattered all he achieved.[134] Such use of Greek ideas bears witness to an extensive two-way cultural

[128] Zandee, *Death as an Enemy*, 18–19, 22, 300–302.

[129] Zandee, *Death as an Enemy*, 16–17, 20–24.

[130] In Egyptian mythology, Ammit or the Devourer was a monster who sat with an open mouth by the scales. It was depicted with the head of a crocodile, foreparts of a lion and hindparts of a hippopotamus. Spencer, *Death in Ancient Egypt*, 144–45.

[131] To have these kinds of contradictory ideas within a single narrative is by no means strange. The Egyptian concept of life after death did not form a logical and coherent whole but later beliefs appear side by side with older ones; Spencer, *Death in Ancient Egypt*, 139. This phenomenon is not, of course, restricted to Egyptian ideas of the afterworld but apply as well to the Greek, Jewish and Christian ones.

[132] Griffith refers to an ancient sculpture found in Hieraconpolis where a door-socket is depicted in the form of a man on whose chest the door is pivoted; *Stories*, 46. Cf. Maspero, "Contes relatifs," 499–500; Zandee, *Death as an Enemy*, 301–302.

[133] This was also noted by Gressmann, *Vom reichen Mann*, 32–34. Cf. also Pieper, "Setna-Roman," 72; Griffiths, *Divine Verdict*, 229.

[134] The idea of endless work as eternal punishment is also known elsewhere in Greek mythology. Sisyphus has to roll a stone to the top of a mountain over and over again (*Od.* 11,593–600), the Danaids have to carry water in a sieve (Apollod, 2,1,4; Lucian, *Dial. mar.* 6).

influence between Egypt and Greece in the Hellenistic period.[135] The reversal pattern may well be seen as part of a similar cultural exchange without postulating any theories of genetic dependency.

All in all, it is obvious that the significance of the Egyptian and Jewish stories has been grossly overestimated. They are not as illuminating for understanding Luke's story as often assumed but there is no need to dismiss them entirely, either. They, as well as the works of Lucian introduced by Hock and other ancient accounts, indicate that the reversal of fate of rich and poor after death was a well-known folkloric motif that circulated all over the Hellenistic world. In this respect, the Rich Man and Lazarus is not unique but there is no reason to argue for its dependency on any particular, fixed story.

[135] It is worth emphasizing the two-way nature of this exchange. Cf. Griffiths who tends to see Egypt as "the ultimate source" of all kinds of cultural borrowings; "Cross-cultural," 9.

## CHAPTER THREE

# THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The survey of the scholarship on the Rich Man and Lazarus shows that the proposed parallels are not very helpful as far as the afterlife scene in the story is concerned. The reversal pattern includes the basic distinction between the bliss of the poor man and the torments of the rich man but, especially in the case of the tormented one, the conditions are depicted quite differently in different stories. In neither the Egyptian nor the Jewish version is there any mention of fire, as in Luke (v. 24).[1] In addition to the tormenting fire, there are many other details in the description of the afterlife that do not have any equivalent in the proposed parallels. These include the figure of Abraham, angels carrying the dead, the great chasm which separates the blessed from the tormented ones, and so on.[2] The imagery of the Lukan afterworld has not been fully explored.

If the proposed parallels do not suffice, where should we turn? An obvious answer, of course, is to Jewish literature. The story includes clear Jewish elements, most notably the figure of Abraham in the hereafter. The Hebrew Bible, however, does not help very much since the development of the idea of postmortem rewards and punishments in Judaism is largely a later phenomenon. Thus the most illustrative works belong to the Pseudepigrapha of Hellenistic and Roman times. The relevance of *1 Enoch* has already been noted

---

[1] This is not to deny that both Egyptian and Jewish ideas of the afterlife include the conception of fire. In Egyptian thinking, fire was usually related to total destruction, not to eternal torture; Zandee, *Death as an Enemy*, 14–15.

[2] An attempt to explain these different features of the story on the basis of the Egyptian tale is made by Grobel, ". . . Whose name," 378–80. According to him, both Abraham's bosom and the place where the rich man is can be best explained as different compartments of Amente. Even though the Egyptian tale does not mention water in the hall where the poor man is, the figure of Osiris is constantly associated with water in Egyptian mythology. Moreover, Abraham is a Jewish substitute for Osiris, the angels carrying the dead are substituted for an Egyptian equivalent, perhaps Horus, or the falcon of Horus or the barque of the dead, none of which, however, is mentioned in the extant tale. Luke may well have envisioned the dwelling places of Lazarus and the rich man as different compartments of the same place (Hades) which comes close to the description of the several halls of Amente in the Demotic tale but the other parallels drawn by Grobel are less convincing.

but there are also other interesting texts. Many apocalyptic writings, such as 4 Ezra and *2 Baruch*, envision otherworldly events and conditions. A similar worldview is also reflected in many other roughly contemporary Jewish works.

Other texts must be considered in addition to the Jewish writings. The Hellenistic age brought cultures closer together than ever before and created an atmosphere that was open to influences from different traditions. Thus, also the texts of different Jewish groups were hellenized[3] and it is not always possible or sensible to try to distinguish "Jewish" ideas from "Hellenistic" ones. Moreover, along with many other scholars, I picture Luke as belonging to the third generation of Christians.[4] He might have been Christian by birth and probably his family was originally pagan. Thus Judaism and Jewish writings were valuable to him as they represented an important phase in the salvation history but they were not otherwise part of his own religious heritage. Luke was well acquainted with the LXX but was probably at least as well at home with the non-Jewish world and its views. The early Christian ideas on life after death were hardly an inner-Christian or inner-Jewish affair but were part of the more general "spirit of late antiquity."[5] Thus it is essential to take into account the overall view on life after death in the Hellenistic age. This includes the investigation of relevant Greek and Latin texts as well.

The purpose of this study, then, is to take a closer look at the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, focusing especially on its afterlife scene. There are two basic questions I wish to ask concerning the otherworldly scene. The first one is its relation to the wider cultural context of the Hellenistic world. How does it relate to other descriptions of the fate of the dead in the ancient Mediterranean world? The second question is the relation of the Lukan description to the overall context in Luke-Acts. How does it fit Luke's eschatological views and the other references to otherworldly fate in his double work?

[3] Of course, the degree of hellenization varied but, ironic as it is, it seems that those groups who were most fervent about keeping to the "pure" traditional faith were also those who assimilated the most Greek influence into their thought; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 311.

[4] Luke distinguishes himself and his contemporaries from the apostles (the first generation) and the *Urzeit* of the church (the second generation); Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," 305–306.

[5] Cf. Robinson, "Introduction: the Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship," 15.

In this study, I argue that the Lukan description coheres well with other Hellenistic descriptions of the afterlife. The basic structure in Luke's scene, the division of the rewarded and the tormented dead, is well-rooted in other Hellenistic writings, both Jewish and pagan. In order to show this, I begin my study with an extensive survey of the Greco-Roman and Jewish sources that deal with the question. This survey is undertaken in Part II of this work. To place the various sources in proper context, it is necessary to include a basic historical outline of the different traditions. In addition to literary sources I also discuss the evidence based on epigraphic material. In my view, the epigraphic evidence does not prove, as often assumed, that belief in differentiated fates after death belonged only to the small literary elite while the majority, the illiterate masses, held to the traditional idea of a gloomy Hades where all the dead shared a shadowy existence and were treated indiscriminately. On the contrary, it seems that the idea of postmortem rewards and punishments was fairly widespread.

Not only the basic division but also other elements of Luke's description have several counterparts in other Hellenistic texts. Part III of this work is devoted to an examination of these. The reversal of fates of rich and poor after death is found in both Jewish and pagan writings. The other structuring theme in Luke's story, the possibility of learning the fate of the dead by means of a message from the otherworld, is likewise a frequent narrative motif in several other accounts. Many of the details in the afterlife scene, such as angels escorting the (pious) dead, Abraham receiving the righteous, fire and thirst in the place of torment, refreshment and consolation in the place of the blessed, a dividing barrier between these places, and depiction of souls in bodily terms, also occur in other descriptions of the fate of the dead. This makes it abundantly clear that the afterlife scene in the Rich Man and Lazarus is constructed with well-known imagery that is used all over the ancient Mediterranean world.

My second claim is that Luke does not have a coherent theology concerning the fate of the dead. The afterlife imagery in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus serves first and foremost the main point Luke wishes to make, namely, the call to repentance. The image used, the immediate retribution and compensation after death, strengthens the moral of the story and should not be read as a part of a consistent eschatological doctrine. In Part IV of this study, I review the different passages in Luke-Acts that illuminate the question.

It becomes evident that Luke uses several different images that do not form a coherent system. This casts serious doubt on the long-cherished scholarly view that eschatology is the key for understanding Luke's gospel and the purpose for writing it. Instead, the author of Luke-Acts has more practical aims and eschatology serves his paraenetic teaching.

# PART II

# DIVIDING THE DEAD: THE HELLENISTIC MATRIX

CHAPTER FOUR

# PRELIMINARY REMARKS: FROM FIXED PARALLELS TO INTERTEXTUALITY

The overview of previous scholarship (chap. 2) has made it clear that the long held scholarly consensus concerning the extra-biblical parallels to the Rich Man and Lazarus does not sufficiently explain the afterlife imagery it displays. There is a certain resemblance between the Demotic folktale, the rabbinic stories, and Luke's story but the similarities are on a general level and do not account for the details of Luke's description. The idea that any particular stories—whether literary or oral—would explain the afterlife scene in Luke's story does not correspond to the findings of recent orality studies. Instead of fixed parallels and direct dependency, we should speak of intertextual relations, common motifs and images that were used in the cultural milieu in the first century Mediterranean world.

A natural starting point for investigating the cultural context of Luke's description is to compare it to contemporary Jewish accounts. The available sources attest to a great diversity of beliefs concerning life after death in ancient Judaism. Especially illuminating points of comparison are offered by several apocalyptic writings. The first Christian century was included in the prime period of apocalypticism[1] and most New Testament writings—including the synoptic gospels—reflect an apocalyptic worldview.[2] What is typical of the apocalyptic writings is the idea of differentiated afterlife: no longer do all the deceased face a similar fate but rewards await the good, punishments the wicked.[3] Moreover, apocalyptic eschatology was not

[1] For the definition of the term see below pp. 125–28.

[2] The famous slogan of Käsemann that apocalypticism was the "mother of all Christian theology" may be an exaggeration (Käsemann, "Die Anfänge der christlichen Theologie," 100), especially as far as it seems to view "Christian theology" as a monolith. Surely not all early Christian groups or all the writings produced by them can be labeled "apocalyptic" but ideas concerning post-mortem life typical of apocalyptic eschatology were a central part of most Christian teaching.

[3] Collins, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," 119. Scholarly opinion is divided over whether apocalypses are literary creations or reflections of visionary experiences; see the discussion in Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 95–114. It is difficult to give

restricted to apocalypses but similar ideas occur within different literary genres. This makes it likely that belief in differentiated fates—which forms the core of the Lukan story—was widely held in contemporary Judaism.

Beyond Jewish ideas, it is essential to take into account the overall view on life after death in the wider Greco-Roman intertextual milieu.[4] There are several reasons for this. First of all, the Judaism of the time was hellenized Judaism. The degree of hellenization varied but it is fair to assume that those writers who wrote in Greek, such as the authors of many apocalyptic and other pseudepigraphic texts,[5] belong to the more hellenized end of the spectrum. In the light of these documents, it is more justified to regard Judaism as an ethnic subculture within Hellenism[6] than to make a distinction between "Greco-Roman" and "Jewish" elements in these writings.[7] The writers of these documents, like Luke and his readers as well,

a definite answer. As Himmelfarb points out, most apocalypses use extremely conventional literary images. On the other hand, as Couliano argues, this conventionality may be due to cultural intertextuality: the visionaries describe their visions in culturally accepted, conventional ways; *Out of This World: Otherworldly Journeys from Gilgamesh to Albert Einstein*, 7–9.

[4] I adopt the term "intertextual milieu" from Matthews, "*Apocryphal* Intertextual *Act*ivities," 128, 132. Each writer has his or her own intertextual milieu that differs to a greater or lesser extent from that of others but here I use the term in a broader sense to refer to the overall Hellenistic cultural environment.

[5] I follow the custom of using the term "Pseudepigrapha" to refer to the corpus of non-canonical Jewish (and Jewish-Christian) documents that were produced between ca. 200 B.C.E. and 200 C.E. The term is somewhat unfortunate and misleading as not all of them were falsely attributed to a famous figure from the past and the phenomenon occurs within other bodies of literature as well. On the other hand, the term "intertestamental" writings is no less unproblematic as it carries in itself the ideological division of the Biblical writings into two "testaments." Moreover, not all of these documents postdate the latest writings of the Hebrew Bible and precede the earliest New Testament writings.

[6] Thus Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, xiii–xiv. For this reason, I find the often made distinction between "apocalyptic eschatology" and "hellenistic eschatology" (recently, e.g., Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften und neutestamentliche Eschatologie*, 1; Aune, "Transformations of Apocalypticism in Early Christianity," 57–58) quite unfortunate. Jewish apocalyptic thinking was thoroughly hellenized; it was Hellenistic.

[7] *Contra* Peres, who in his analysis of the New Testament eschatology, constantly makes a distinction between Jewish and Hellenistic elements. For example, in discussing key passages in Luke, he asks explicitly whether Luke is thinking in Jewish or Hellenistic terms. In his view, the bodily appearance of the rich man and Lazarus in the hereafter reveals that Luke shares Jewish monistic anthropology; "Hier denkt Lukas jüdisch." On the other hand, the idea that the penitent thief on the cross will enter paradise at the moment of his death is thoroughly Hellenistic. "Lukas denkt hier also hellenistisch." *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 187–89, 195. See my discussion on these passages below, chaps. 11.5. and 15.2.

lived in a traditional society that prevailed all around the Mediterranean basin (and even further). Many of its features were common everywhere, including the worldview.[8]

Secondly, the hellenization of the Jewish symbolic world seems to be especially strong concerning different ideas of the afterlife.[9] In the LXX, Sheol (שְׁאוֹל), the underworld, was translated as ᾅδης. As the language changed, many features of Greek thought found their way into Jewish thinking. There are numerous examples in the Jewish writings of how Greek ideas appear in perfect harmony with their Jewish counterparts. For example, in the *Sibylline Oracles*, the destiny of the ungodly is ". . . broad Tartarus and the repulsive recesses of Gehenna" (4,184–86).[10] In another passage, the righteous are placed "in the Elysian plain" where they have ". . . the long waves of the deep perennial Acherusian lake" (2,334–38).[11] Another allusion to the Elysian fields and the Acherusian lake is in the *Greek Apocalypse of Baruch* where the righteous souls reside in "an unbroken plain," in the middle of which there is "a lake of water" (10:2).[12] Moreover, the place is further described as the one ". . . where the souls of the righteous come whenever they meet together in groups to talk to one another" (10:5) which resembles Plato's description of the afterlife.[13] Archaeological finds of coins in skulls in some Jewish graves, considered as payment for Charon's ferry service across the Acheron, also point to the adaptation of Greek ideas.[14] It remains uncertain,

[8] Cf. Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 456.

[9] See Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology*, especially 1–38; Hengel, *Judaism*, 180–210.

[10] All quotations from the *Sibylline Oracles* are according to Collins in *OTP 1*.

[11] Similarly, in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, angels carry the dead Adam to the Lake of Acheron and wash him there; *L.A.E.* 37:3. Cf. the Christian apocalypses *Apoc. Pet.* 14; *Apoc. Paul* 22. The otherworldly river Oceanus is named in *T. Ab.* (recension B) 8:3.

[12] Cf. Harlow, *The Greek* Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) *in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, 144.

[13] Plato *Resp.* 10,614e–615a. See further below p. 73.

[14] See Hachlili & Killebrew ("Jewish Funerary Customs during the Second Temple Period, in the Light of the Excavations at the Jericho Necropolis," 118, 128) on the excavations in the Jericho necropolis. On the finds near Jerusalem, including the ossuary that has been assumed to contain the bones of the high priest Caiphas, see Puech, *La croyance des essénniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans la judaïsme ancient I: La résurrection des morts et le contexte scripturaire*, 194–95. For more on the Greek habit of placing coins in tombs, see Stevens, "Charon's Obol and Other Coins in Ancient Funerary Practice."

however, whether such a practice reflects anything other than mere convention.[15]

Thirdly, Luke himself was an educated member of the Hellenistic society. We are not certain of his ethnic background but it is evident that he knew and read the Jewish scriptures in Greek.[16] Moreover, his double work reveals that he must have received an education and thus probably knew both the classics and many of the works of his contemporary Greek-speaking culture. His acquaintance with literature is shown especially in the book of Acts, which shares many features in common with Greek historiography[17] and contains allusions, even direct citations from pagan authors.[18] Luke is a master of the Greek language and seems to be sensitive to variations in style, a feature common to all ancient Greek literature where different dialects were even artificially preserved in different genres.[19] Lukan variations range from the Semitic style of the birth narratives (Lk 1–2), imitating the language of the Septuagint, to the high style, e.g., of Paul's speech in the Areopagus in Athens (Acts 17:22–31). Luke is well aware that, in this context, Paul cannot have referred to Jewish scriptures. Instead, he uses Greek poets as his authorities.[20] Luke himself has been called "the only littérateur among the authors of the New Testament books" who ". . . seems to have a cosmopolitan outlook."[21] Thus his own literary milieu was not restricted to Jewish writings.

In what follows, I will compare the features of the Lukan description of the hereafter with different Greco-Roman and Jewish accounts

---

[15] Cf. Donaldson, "Parallels: Use, Misuse, and Limitations," 202.

[16] I agree with the standard scholarly position according to which Luke is a representative of Gentile Christianity; see the discussion on Luke's ethnic background in Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 41–47; cf. Conzelmann, "Luke's Place," 305–306; Syreeni, "Matthew, Luke, and the Law: A Study in Hermeneutical Exegesis", 142; Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 140. It is possible that he was Christian by birth and even though his own roots were in paganism, he was well acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures.

[17] For more, see Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*.

[18] In Acts 17:28, Luke cites the pagan poet Aratos; see Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 525, n. 1. Also the beginning of the verse—ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν—may be a citation, perhaps a Stoic formulation. Haenchen, *Acts*, 524, n. 3. Such a slogan may have been a cultural commonplace, not a conscious citation from a particular text, cf. Downing, "Common Strands in Pagan, Jewish and Christian Eschatologies in the First Century," 206.

[19] Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 123.

[20] Haenchen, *Acts*, 524–25; Plümacher, *Lukas*, 97–98.

[21] Cadbury, *Making*, 239–40.

of the afterlife in order to shed new light on the example story. I am not suggesting that there could not be other relevant accounts, say from Persia, Mesopotamia, or Egypt.[22] It is obvious that different influences on religious thought moved from one culture to another and cannot be restricted to a single source. All Near Eastern cultures were more or less in contact with each other and shared a common "cultural memory."[23] Especially in the Hellenistic age, a common language aided the diffusion of different ideas.[24] However, I limit my investigation to the abovementioned sources because they offer the nearest and most natural intertextual milieu for Luke. Whether or not the different elements in Luke's description originate from further off, they were probably most familiar to him through his own Hellenistic culture.[25]

This kind of comparison is in itself nothing new. From the very beginning of the study of the history-of-religion, parallels have been sought to illuminate certain texts or ideas in the New Testament, prime examples of which, for the Lukan story, are the parallels suggested by Gressmann, Bultmann, and others. Parallels have also been sought from different Jewish and pagan sources. However, what has been characteristic of many such enterprises, and which is *not* the purpose of this study, is the sketching of a "background" for a certain New Testament text or idea. I am not speaking of a "background" for the afterlife scene in the Rich Man and Lazarus because of the several problems connected with the use of such terminology. First, it often presumes a static view of the surrounding religious world(s) as a fixed system with an unchanging and immobile set of

[22] According to Griffiths, Jewish and Christian eschatology was influenced both by Egyptian and Persian thought. He argues that the belief in individual judgment after death derives from Egypt and the idea of a general universal judgment at the end of time from Persia. What is distinctive in Jewish eschatology is the figure of the Messiah and his central role in the judgment. Griffiths, *Divine Verdict*, 254–59. For Mesopotamian influence, see, e.g., Kvanvig, "Roots of Apocalyptic I: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure", 225–346.

[23] Cf. Pongratz-Leisten, "When the Gods Are Speaking: Towards Defining the Interface between Polytheism and Monotheism," 139.

[24] Cf. Griffiths, *Divine Verdict*, 243. It is worth noting that the influence on religious thought is seldom a one-way system even though the effect of a dominant culture is usually stronger on the minority cultures than vice versa.

[25] For example, there are parallel ideas in both Persian and Jewish demonology/angelology, ideas concerning divisions of the world and time, and eschatology, which makes it likely that these similarities are somehow interconnected. Yet the extent or even the direction of the influence is hard to discern. See Shaked, "Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.," 314–24, cf. Hengel, *Judaism*, 193–94.

ideas.[26] Second, it easily implies that Luke himself is not a part of his "background" but stands apart from it choosing what he likes from it.[27] Third, the idea of a "background" involves a certain amount of hindsight, often with more or less pejorative overtones, as if it were possible to say in what direction contemporary phenomena will turn, what comes to the fore and what falls into the "background." Writings that, from a later perspective, seem to contain rudiments for certain ideas are not themselves meant as forerunners of later development.[28] Thus, it is problematic to say that, for example, Homer's and Plato's descriptions form a "background" for Luke's view of the afterlife, even though both had a strong influence on many writers in Hellenistic and Roman times and thus contributed to the way life after death was then conceived.

Instead of the static "background," I wish to place Luke's account in the wider cultural intertextual milieu of which Luke himself also is a part. This kind of cultural intertextuality does not form a fixed or clearly defined category but refers to the complex and multiform set of beliefs that were current at the time.[29] In order to complete this task, I read the Lukan account in light of other texts from Hellenistic and Roman periods to find relevant counterparts to the different elements in the imagery Luke uses in his afterlife scene. Many of the relevant texts reflect ideas that were shaped and changed over the course of time, which makes it necessary to refer to earlier writings as well.

Another commonly used term, which I try to avoid, is "parallel" as that term is also loaded with unfortunate connotations. More than four decades ago, Samuel Sandmel delivered his Presidential Address to the Society of Biblical Literature[30] to warn about "parallelomania," that is an extravagant search for similarities between two texts

---

[26] Cf. Robinson, "Introduction," 12–13 for a still adequate criticism of a static definition of a "background."

[27] Cf. Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament," 299.

[28] Cf. Bernstein, *Formation*, 2.

[29] On "cultural intertextuality," see Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*, 58–62; Valantasis, "The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The *Acts of Thomas* and Cultural Intertextuality," 263–64; Uro, *Thomas*, 46–50. In the words of Valantasis, cultural intertextuality "is not limited merely to written or literary texts, but may revolve, in fact, about the invocation and interaction of cultural "texts" which would include performances, concepts, images, and metaphors, as well as literary texts and any number of other cultural phenomena interrelating materially."

[30] The address was published in *JBL* 81 (1962), 1–13.

and hasty conclusions drawn from them concerning the presumed source and derivation.[31] Even though far from being the first one,[32] Sandmel's point was well-founded and hit its target with full force. According to him, "parallelomania" looms wherever parallels are found even though none really exist. This is often the case when excerpts isolated from their own context are juxtaposed; if the larger context is taken into account, the passages might reflect quite different ideas.[33] Alternatively, "parallelomania" may mean exaggerating the significance of the disclosed similarities; in some cases the similar ideas have no direct relation with each other but arise from a common heritage or context.[34] This criticism was, however, not aimed at literary parallels as such nor the study of them, but at the misuse of parallels and the methodological shortcomings in searching for them.[35]

In recent years, then, the quest for relevant parallels for different New Testament writings or ideas in them has been continued, sometimes with better, sometimes with lesser success.[36] A good example is the vast international research project *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, whose ambitious aim is ". . . to investigate everything that has been preserved from Greek and Roman antiquity in relation to its significance for a proper understanding of the NT."[37] The search for relevant parallels is justified and important as religious ideas easily cross cultures and originally external thinking is adopted and absorbed in new settings.[38] However, the claim of direct dependency, especially of literary dependency, requires careful and methodologically sound scrutiny, and is not as easily determined as sometimes assumed.[39] Moreover, it is worth emphasizing that the adoption of

---

[31] Sandmel defines "parallelomania" as standing for "that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction;" "Parallelomania," 1.

[32] See Donaldson, "Parallels," 194–98.

[33] Sandmel, "Parallelomania," 2–3.

[34] Sandmel, "Parallelomania," 3–6.

[35] Sandmel, "Parallelomania," 1–2; "The key word in my essay is extravagance." Cf. Donaldson, "Parallels," 193–94.

[36] More than twenty years after Sandmel's address, Donaldson complained how ". . . the problem to which he drew attention continues to be a pressing one for NT scholarship;" Parallels," 193.

[37] Van der Horst, "Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti," 1159.

[38] Cf. Griffiths, "Cross-cultural Eschatology," 7.

[39] See the considerations of Donaldson, "Parallels," 198–204.

a certain idea does not tell much as such; the function and meaning of the idea in a new cultural context may differ significantly from the original one.[40] The different surviving texts are written in different social circumstances, often for different purposes. Thus each text is context specific, that is, part of a particular tradition, and thus contains elements not found in any other equally context specific text.[41] Not even a straight citation from another text necessarily reflects similar kind of thinking but may be used to serve a different point.[42]

In an important article on parallels, T.L. Donaldson discerns three types of parallels.[43] First, following the lead of Deissmann,[44] he makes a distinction between genealogical and analogical parallels.[45] Within genealogical parallels, he distinguishes stronger and weaker parallels. The former exist when ". . . there is a direct, straight-line influence from one element of the parallel to the other; one religious tradition has been directly influenced by, or has clearly appropriated something from, the other at this point."[46] On the other hand, a weaker parallel is found

> . . . in religious contexts—such as is the case in first century Judaism—where several related yet distinguishable religious groups share a common milieu with a greater or lesser degree of overlap. Here mutual dependence on a common stock of floating tradition can result in the appearance of similar elements in more than one group. In such a situation the genealogical connection is there, but it is diffuse and mediated through an indirect process.[47]

Using Donaldson's terminology, my aim is at seeking such "weaker genealogical parallels", or, to use a more recent expression, "inter-

[40] Sandmel, "Parallelomania," 5–6; Donaldson, "Parallels," 202–203; cf. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 19–20; Stoops, "Introduction: Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives," 2; Pongratz-Leisten, "When Gods Are Speaking," 140–41.

[41] Cf. Lapinkivi, *The Sumerian Sacred Marriage in the Light of Comparative Evidence*, 18–19.

[42] For example, many Hellenistic writers frequently cite Homer in connections which otherwise reflect a totally different worldview.

[43] Donaldson, "Parallels," 198–201. Cf. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On The Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*, 47–53.

[44] Cf. Donaldson, "Parallels," 195.

[45] For a recent discussion on these categories, see Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 169–70.

[46] Donaldson, "Parallels," 200.

[47] Alternatively, this type of parallel might be called an "analogical parallel in a common milieu" but since the genealogical connection is involved, Donaldson prefers the term "weaker genealogical parallel;" "Parallels," 200.

textual relations." In other words, I am not claiming any dependency on the part of Luke on any of the writings to which I compare his account.[48] It is hard to know—and impossible to prove—that Luke knew certain pieces of literature that have survived to this day. The surviving body of ancient literature is incomplete and Luke may well have known literature that has not been preserved. When early Jewish literature is discussed, other problems also emerge. The question of dating cannot be answered with full certainty and so it is not possible to know for sure what writings are undoubtedly pre-Lukan. Another problem is that most of the pseudepigrapha are known only in rather late, often medieval manuscripts. Since many writings were preserved by Christians, they often include heavy Christian editing. Moreover, most of the texts are known only in translations, making it impossible to know in what form Luke might have known them.

Regardless of the abovementioned difficulties, it is evident that Luke's description is well comparable with other ancient accounts. What I am suggesting, then, is that the overall picture of the Lukan afterworld, reflected in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, fits well into the general milieu of the ancient Mediterranean world. Many elements in the story have clear counterparts in different Greco-Roman and Jewish descriptions. There is no need to seek "parallels" from further away. This is true concerning both the core features of Luke's description and the many details that appear in it. The basic division between those who are rewarded and those who are punished after death is well-rooted in both pagan and Jewish sources. The narrative themes Luke uses to structure his story, the reversal of fate after death and a message from the dead to the living, also have several counterparts in contemporary literature.

Comparison between two (or more) texts involves several methodological pitfalls, one of which is the tendency to read the texts under comparison on unequal terms.[49] Seeking similarities often involves a temptation not to do due justice to the "other," the less familiar text. This is why it is not sufficient to list separate excerpts containing parallel ideas but also the "other" text(s) must be understood as part of a larger context. For this reason, I treat the afterlife

[48] Cf. Himmelfarb, *Tours*, 2.5–6. Instead of claiming literary dependency of one text on another, she speaks of "tradition" to "suggest historical continuity, while leaving open the precise nature of the connection between particular texts."

[49] See the illuminating discussion of Smith, *Drudgery*, 85–115.

imagery in the Hellenistic cultural matrix at length. This is especially important as far as the Greco-Roman sources are concerned since they are usually less familiar to New Testament scholars.

The main sources for my investigation are literary. This poses yet another question. How representative is the view—or the different views—reflected in these sources? As the literary sources reflect only the views of the small literary elite—both concerning their own beliefs and the beliefs they assumed the common people held—it is also necessary to take a look at the epigraphical evidence gathered from epitaphs. However, a critical reading of the literary sources may also add to our knowledge of the popular views, otherwise so regrettably lost to us.

CHAPTER FIVE

# DIFFERENTIATED FATES IN GRECO-ROMAN SOURCES

The most obvious feature in the afterlife scene in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus is the separation of the dead. Lazarus is consoled in Abraham's bosom but the rich man finds himself in torments in Hades. Belief in differentiated fates after death is well attested in several sources from Greco-Roman period.[1] This differentiation is made either on cultic grounds (initiates receive a better lot than the uninitiated) or on moral grounds (the just are rewarded, the wicked are punished). Such views are reflected, for example, in texts associated with mysteries and in the eschatological myths of Plato. Later depictions are heavily indebted to Plato and often describe the rewards and punishments, either the one or the other or both, in greater detail.

The earliest Greek descriptions of the afterlife, however, include no moral judgment connected with death, nor any division among the dead. In the Homeric epics, the dead are viewed as a collective: exclusive of some rare exceptions, everybody dies[2] and shares

[1] The overall picture of how the ideas on the afterlife in the Greek world shifted and changed over the centuries has been presented often and need not be repeated here in detail. The classic treatment of the subject is *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, the epoch-making work of Erwin Rohde, first published in 1894. Other important contributions are in von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (2 volumes) and in Nilsson's *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (also in two volumes), even though neither gives a consistent discussion concerning the afterlife (see, however, *Glaube 2*, 56–60, 182–98; 310–15 and *Geschichte 1*, 174–99; 378–84; 688–96; 815–26 and *2*, 231–42; 543–58). Roman concepts are studied by Cumont in *After Life in Roman Paganism* and *Lux perpetua*. More recent surveys are found, e.g., in Bernstein, *Formation*, 21–129; Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 3–35, Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 11–26 and Segal, *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West*, 204–47. Cf. also Garland, *The Greek Way of Death*, 60–66, Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, 132–38 and Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy*, 23–58. For a recent survey on Roman attitudes concerning death, see J. Davies, *Death, Burial and Rebirth in the Religions of Antiquity*, 139–54.

[2] According to *Od.* 3,236–38, "death that comes to all alike not even the gods can keep away from a man they love, when once the dreadful fate of death with its long-lasting sorrow takes him in its grip." (All quotations from the *Odyssey* are

an equal fate in the shadowy realm of Hades.[3] Ideas concerning personal rewards and punishments emerge only in later sources. This shift from common fate towards differentiated fates has often been attributed to "Orphic" influence.[4] Even though this outline is correct in broad terms, some qualifications must be made, not least concerning the assumed role of "Orphic eschatology" (to which I return below, pp. 75–80).

First, the evidence we have is meager and the sketch of any overall development rests on very few literary sources. Homer, the most ancient witness, is also the only one from the eighth century B.C.E. The subsequent centuries offer even less; all we have are some more or less ambivalent allusions, such as are found in Hesiod and the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, for example. More evidence is available only from the beginning of the fifth century on with Pindar, several playwrights, and philosophers. The scarcity of sources poses serious questions. How likely is it that the surviving sources represent the only prevalent view of the time? And how methodologically sound is it to base any linear development on so few pieces of evidence that leave centuries-wide gaps?[5]

Second, this change should not be understood as linear progression. Many recent studies emphasize that the shifts concerning views on death and the afterlife take place slowly and are a complex

according to Dawe.) The inevitability of death also occurs in many later sources and is a favorite theme in Greek epitaphs where expressions such as οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατος appear frequently; see Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 188–89.

[3] Hades, the god of the underworld, was a brother of Zeus and the ruler of the dead. For this reason, the abode of the dead was called the kingdom of Hades (Ἀίδαο δόμοι, Ἅιδου οἶκος etc.), later simply Hades. The etymology of the name seems to go back to an Indo-European root with a meaning "unseen, invisible." This was a suitable attribute of the god who remained in the underworld and could not be seen on earth like the other gods. See Beekes, "*Hades* and *Elysion*," 17–19.

[4] Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, 23; Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 136; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 11–24.

[5] An example of such a simplistic view is that of Spronk (*Beatific Afterlife*, 135–36). He traces the development of the concept of Elysium in four stages. First, only a special favorite of the gods, Menelaus, is granted a beatific life with the gods, as witnessed in *Od.* 4. Next, in the time of Hesiod, all heroes who survived the battles of Thebes and Troy were believed to have been led into Elysium (*Op.* 167–73). Later, dead heroes such as Achilles are also allowed a place in there (Pindar *Ol.* 2,79–80). The end of the development originates with the mystery cults when Elysium becomes open to all. This simplicity is all the more surprising as Spronk elsewhere is fully aware of the complexity of the concepts of the afterlife in ancient Israel.

process.[6] Even if new ideas are embraced, they are incorporated with the old ones without displacing them so that ". . . old attitudes can be found side by side with new ones in the same age, in different places and circles, but sometimes also within one individual."[7] Moreover, even though it is easy to see that a later description differs remarkably from an earlier one, it is often difficult, if not impossible, to determine how and why and when this shift has taken place. New ideas that are incorporated into a culture cannot be considered totally new, otherwise they would have been considered strange and rejected. There must exist some basis for the new beliefs in the traditional thinking upon which the new ideas can be constructed.[8] All this calls into question reconstructions that envision clear transitions from one phase to another, whether due to outside influence (such as "the Orphic influence") or to inter-cultural "development." A careful study of the available sources shows that belief in differentiated fates after death did not appear abruptly in the Greek world but its seeds are found from the earliest literary evidence onwards.

## 5.1. Death in the Homeric Epics

In the Homeric epics, the general picture concerning the fate of the dead seems simple. According to the description of Odysseus' visit to Hades in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*, the realm of the dead is a gloomy and cheerless place where the sun never shines (11,14–19). The dead are flittering shades who cannot be touched (11,204–208; cf. *Il.* 23,99–101).[9] They are witless and powerless and swarm around making squeaking, bat-like noises (11,43.632; cf. 24,6–9). The fate of the dead is not enviable. They are weary and dejected, even the lowliest slave on earth is said to be happier than the dead (11,488–91). There is no indication that something else might await the deceased. Their shadowy existence seems to continue unaltered eternally.[10]

[6] See Sourvinou-Inwood, "A Trauma in Flux: Death in the 8th Century and After," 33–34; *Reading*, 300, 416–17.

[7] Sourvinou-Inwood, "Trauma," 33.

[8] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 169–70.

[9] The soul (ψυχή) is not the personality with sensations, feelings and consciousness but a phantom image which can be seen but not grasped. The soul appears in bodily form and looks exactly like it looked while alive. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classic*, 195–96; Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, 73–80.

[10] This corresponds closely to the ideas reflected in Mesopotamian texts, Scurlock,

The fate of all the dead is similar, irrespective of their deeds or social status on earth. This similar fate does not mean equality, however. In many ancient cultures, life in the netherworld was believed to continue the earthly life: those who ruled on earth would also rule in the netherworld and a slave in this world would also be a slave in the next.[11] This hierarchy is not clearly visible in the Homeric account since Odysseus only encounters heroes of the Trojan war and other members of the aristocracy. No other inhabitants of Hades are mentioned, no ordinary folk, let alone slaves.

A closer look at the Homeric description, however, reveals contradictory elements in it. This is hardly surprising considering the composite nature of the epics.[12] The realm of the dead is situated under the earth, yet it is also situated on the furthest edge of the earth, by river Oceanus, in the land of the Cimmerians.[13] The dead are not able to talk or even recognize Odysseus before they drink the blood he offers to them.[14] Yet further in the narrative Odysseus

"Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Mesopotamian Thought," 1887; cf. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 96–104; Bernstein, *Formation*, 3–11; J. Davies, *Death*, 47–59.

[11] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 234; cf. Bottéro, "La mythologie de la mort en Mésopotamie ancienne," 35. The hierarchy among the dead in Greek literature is attested in some later sources, e.g., the fifth century tragedies, see Aesch. *Pers.* 681–93; *Cho.* 354–62, Soph. *El.* 836–39.

[12] The Homeric epics consist of material from various ages and societies which makes it only natural that they express different kinds of beliefs, even those that seem to be mutually exclusive; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 13. Cf. Burkert who notes that, in the Homeric mythology, "contradictions are freely tolerated;" *Greek Religion*, 196.

[13] Hades' location under the earth is evident in *Od.* 24, which is probably a late seventh or early sixth century addition to the Homeric epic, and in several passages in the *Iliad*, e.g., 20,61 and 23,100–101; see Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 59–60. According to her reading, access to Hades by sailing to the west was exceptional—as exceptional as reaching Hades while alive. Be that as it may, all through the Homeric epics Hades is described as distant from the world of the living, either far-away or far-below. Both descriptions emphasize the distance between the living and the dead. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 196; Bernstein, *Formation*, 25.

[14] Garland, *Greek Way*, 1–2; Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 8–9. Johnston emphasizes the powerlessness of the Homeric dead; they have no power over the living. Similarly Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 197. However, later the dead must be appeased, Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 80–81. But must we here see a development that is due to outside influence? Could not the powerlessness of the dead as depicted by Homer and the power the dead have over the well-being of the living be another example of the "contradictions that are freely tolerated?" (see above n. 12). A similar ambiguity is seen in Mesopotamian mythology where the dead are depicted as both actively hostile towards the living and as passive melancholy figures, pitying themselves for forever having lost real life; Bottéro, "Mythologie," 42–43; Scurlock, "Death and Afterlife," 1886–93.

meets others, such as Achilles and Ajax, who presumably have not drunk the blood but still recognize him or talk to him (11,467–72, 553–65).[15] More importantly, there are three exceptions to the common fate, three mythical figures who suffer eternal punishment (11,576–600).[16] Tityus lies on the ground, covering nine acres, and two vultures gnaw at his liver. Tantalus stands in the water, thirsty, but without being able to drink. Whenever he reaches down to drink, the water vanishes. Similarly, tall trees shed their fruit above him, but whenever he reaches out his hands to clutch them, the wind tosses them away. Sisyphus is constantly grasping a monstrous stone with both hands and trying to roll it upward toward the top of a hill. But as often as he is about to hurl it over the top, its weight drives him back and he has to start his toil over again.[17] The difference between these mythical figures and the other dead is that Odysseus sees the former from a distance and they do not come to talk to him, as the other dead do.

These mythical criminals apparently reside in Hades with the other dead.[18] In the *Iliad*, however, Homer describes another place for punishment, Tartarus.[19] This is a prison of the enemies of Zeus, a pit and subterranean dungeon with iron doors and a bronze threshold. It is situated beneath Hades, as far from it as the earth is from the sky (*Il.* 8,13–16). Hesiod gives a more elaborate picture of Tartarus (*Theog.* 713–35).[20] According to him, in the beginning of times when Zeus had conquered his father Cronos in the struggle for supremacy over the earth, the Titans, who opposed Zeus, were locked up in Tartarus, in the nethermost regions of the earth. It is a dark place,

[15] Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 81.

[16] Already in antiquity these lines were condemned as an interpolation and, according to Dawe, "there is a widespread agreement that Minos, Orion, Tityos, Tantalos, Sisyphos, and Heracles together constitute a late addition." *Odyssey*, 460. Others, however, defend their genuineness, see Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 84–89. Be that as it may, the eleventh book was known in its present form centuries before the Roman era.

[17] For details, see Sourvinou-Inwood, "Crime and Punishment: Tityos, Tantalos and Sisyphos in *Odyssey* 11."

[18] Homer introduces them to the narrative with a plain καί (v. 576) and καὶ μήν (vv. 582, 593).

[19] Tartarus is personified in Hesiod's account but his person is nowhere elaborated any further. He was the father of Typhoeus, a dragon with a hundred heads, whom Zeus conquered and flung into Tartarus (*Theog.* 823–80). Cf. Bernstein, *Formation*, 36–37.

[20] For a detailed analysis of the passage, see D. Johnson, "Hesiod's descriptions of Tartarus (*Theogony* 721–819)."

surrounded by a bronze wall and encircled by a threefold darkness. In Hesiod's description, Tartarus is not beneath Hades but above it, as far beneath the earth as the sky is above the earth (720–21).[21] Despite this disagreement concerning the geography of the underworld, it is clear that, according to the early Greek concept, there was the abode of the ordinary dead, Hades where existence was neither happy nor painful, and a separate prison with terrible punishments for mythical criminals and demigods, Tartarus.[22]

In addition to these negative exceptions, there are also some positive ones: individuals who were granted a joyful and blessed life in Elysium (Ἤλυσιον) or the Isles of the Blessed.[23] Strictly speaking, this place is not related to life after death since it is an abiding place of the immortal gods where some mortals, special favorites of the gods, are allowed to enter without dying. There they live eternally without facing death. One of these few favorites is the Lacedaimonean ruler Menelaus to whom gods grant immortality (*Od.* 4,561–69).[24] Another example is Ganymedes whom Zeus abducts to be his cupbearer (*Il.* 20,232–35).[25] According to Homer, Elysium is situated at the end of the world and ". . . that is where men have the easiest life. No snow, never any heavy storms or rain, but always the Ocean[us]

[21] Cf. the Homeric description above. Both emphasize the remoteness of Tartarus and the earth. See D. Johnson, "Hesiod's Description," 13 and n. 12.

[22] Bremmer combines the two and calls Tartarus "the deepest region of Hades;" *Rise and Fall*, 4. Bernstein also attempts to harmonize the different accounts; *Formation*, 32–33, 38–39. According to him, the mythical sufferers in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey* are actually in Tartarus which Odysseus can see from Hades even though the name Tartarus is not mentioned in the text. This kind of systematization is not necessary, it is once more an example of a "tolerable contradiction," see above n. 12.

[23] These two concepts were probably originally separate but had already started to converge in the earliest sources; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 51. For the etymology of Ἤλυσιον, see Beekes, "Hades," 19–23.

[24] Thus Menelaus is also an exception to the rule, otherwise heavily stressed in the epics, that everyone dies. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 17.

[25] Heracles also belongs to the few apotheosized figures. Even though Odysseus sees him in Hades, he only encounters his image (εἴδωλον) for he himself is with the immortal gods; *Od.* 11,602–603. According to Dawe, this passage is an interpolation trying to harmonize two different views; *Odyssey*, 463. Scholiasts ascribed it to Onomacritus, the sixth century B.C.E. seer and poet. Later, Lucian makes fun of this double position of Heracles; *Dial. mort.* 11. According to some traditions, Achilles was snatched from his funeral pyre and conveyed to Leuke (the White Isle), a wooded island situated in the Black Sea, at the mouths of the Danube. There he dwells together with Helen, chanting Homer's verses on Troy. Other dwellers of the island include Ajax the son of Oileus, Ajax the son of Telamon, Patroclus, and Antilochus; Philostratus *Her.* 54,2–55,6; Pausanias 3,19,11–13.

lets cool breezes of the whistling south wind refresh men." Hesiod gives a corresponding description. According to him, in the age of heroes at the dawn of humankind, not everybody died but Zeus sent some to live undying on the Isles of the Blessed, on the shores of Oceanus. They live there ". . . with carefree heart [. . .] fortunate Heroes, for whom the grain-giving soil bears its honey-sweet fruits thrice a year" (*Op.* 161–73).[26]

Thus even though the earliest Greek accounts describe a uniform fate after death, there are also exceptions. It is true that those who are punished in Tartarus and those who enjoy bliss in Elysium are mythical figures and heroes or special favorites of the gods,[27] not ordinary mortals.[28] Thus it is unlikely that ordinary people would have imagined themselves facing a similar fate after death.[29] However, these are examples of the contradictory motifs in the Homeric epics, which at least served as rudiments for more individual treatment of the dead.[30]

Moreover, the Homeric descriptions hardly have universal validity.[31] Even the ordinary mortals in Homer are not very ordinary. All the dead Odysseus encounters are heroes of the Trojan war or other members of the elite.[32] It may be asked, then, how generally held were the beliefs that the Homeric epics reflect. It is most likely that there was more than just one "canonical" view in the Homeric

[26] Translation by West. The concept of the Isles of the Blessed has counterparts in both Egypt and Mesopotamia; Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 89 and 123.

[27] Tantalus, Tityus, and Sisyphus are exceptions to the general rule as they are punished for offending the dignity of the gods and the order of the cosmos, not for ordinary crimes. Garland, *Greek Way*, 60; Sourvinou-Inwood, "Crime," 54. The gods favored Menelaus because he was Zeus' son-in-law and Ganymedes for the sake of his beauty.

[28] See the criticism of Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 12–14. A passage in Plato's *Gorgias* (525c), however, shows that later Tityus, Tantalus and Sisyphus were understood as mortal rulers.

[29] It is not quite clear whether these mythical figures are really dead; at least both Menelaus and Ganymedes were snatched away while alive. See Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 13.

[30] See Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 197–98. Another example is the frequent mention of the Erinyes, the avenging spirits of the underworld. They are said to punish the dead who have sworn a false oath (*Il.* 3,278; 19,260). As Burkert notes, even though the Erinyes in Homer are "simply an embodiment of the act of self-cursing contained in the oath" yet for their vengeance to succeed, the dead must be imagined as more than mere shades void of all consciousness. Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 92.107.

[31] Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 197.

[32] The same holds true for other early evidence, such as Hesiod and Pindar.

times. It would be daring to claim that belief in postmortem rewards and punishments was a popular one in Homer's time and that Homer simply "chose not to emphasize it"[33] but it is quite as daring to suggest that the slim evidence we have would reveal the whole truth. Probably there were many different ideas concerning postmortem fate around, and not all of these were mutually exclusive.[34] The Homeric view is also the poetic view, not a definitive doctrine to which and only to which people would commit themselves.[35]

## 5.2. Towards an Individual Treatment of the Dead

The above considerations mean that it is too straightforward to assume a precise change in the thoughts concerning the fate of the dead and to date this change to a precise period. The gradual shift towards more individual treatment of the dead began quite early and was not an imported novelty.[36] Later both the idea that it was possible, at least for some, to escape death and that the stay in Hades could be happy became more and more frequent.[37] The first indication of the latter belief is found as early as the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (approximately from the mid-seventh century B.C.E.) where a difference is made between those who are initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries and those who are not.[38] In the end of the hymn, it is stated that:

> Blessed (ὄλβιος) is the mortal on earth who has seen these rites,
> But the uninitiate who has no share in them never
> Has the same lot once dead in the dreary darkness (480–82).[39]

Certainly this reference remains obscure. It is not possible to know what the supposed benefits after death were imagined to be. What

[33] Thus Richardson, "Early Greek Views about Life after Death," 54–55.

[34] Cf. Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 359: "In people's beliefs about the afterlife, there are present from the very beginning a large number of overlapping and contradictory themes."

[35] In the words of Sourvinou-Inwood, "poetry articulated theology and mythology, but of course the versions it offered were not authoritative. Though poets were inspired by the Muses, the Muses also lied." *Reading*, 12.

[36] *Contra* Rohde, *Psyche*, 253–55

[37] Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 38–39.

[38] Cf. Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 98.

[39] Translation by Foley. The hymn probably had a central role in the Eleusinian mysteries. The figure of Demeter and her cult share close affinities with that of Ishtar and her cult; Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 160–61.

matters is that the lot of the initiates and the uninitiates is different. As the initiates are blessed, the implication is that the uninitiates will suffer,[40] but this is not stated explicitly.[41] In later sources, the lot of the uninitiated is understood as suffering.[42] For example, Sophocles refers to the Eleusinian mysteries: "For thrice fortunate are those among mortals who have seen these rites before going to Hades; for they alone have life there, while others have every kind of misery" (frg. 837).[43] Pausanias describes a painting by Polygnotos depicting the uninitiated carrying broken jars of water in the underworld (10,31,9.11).[44]

It is also true that, according to the evidence we have on the Eleusinian mysteries, the blessedness of the initiate is primarily connected to this life, not to the life hereafter. The term ὄλβιος usually refers to material happiness but the context of the hymn implies that the initiates are also blessed in their fate after death.[45] The otherworldly happiness is closely related to the worldly one. Demeter takes care of both; she teaches the art of agriculture to grant happiness in this world, and the mysteries to grant it in the otherworld.[46]

Thus, the hymn alludes to a postmortem fate with clearly different features from the earlier epic accounts. First, unlike in the earlier accounts, the dead are believed to be better off than the living.[47] Second, this happy afterlife is no longer reserved for only a few

[40] Thus Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 311. A little earlier in the poem (367–69), Hades threatens wrongdoers, that is, all those who fail to propitiate Persephone, with punishments. Whether these punishments are post-mortem or not is not explicit.

[41] According to Richardson, the language may be deliberately vague: an indefinite threat suggests more than it expresses; *Homeric Hymn*, 315.

[42] The following and many other examples are given by Richardson, *Homeric Hymn*, 311–12; cf. Foley, *The Homeric* Hymn to Demeter*: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretative Essays*, 70–71.

[43] Translation by Lloyd-Jones.

[44] The Danaids were also punished for the murder of their husbands to endlessly carry water in sieves; see Apollodorus *Bibl.* 2,1,5. Futile work in different forms was a popular way of describing punishment in the afterworld; cf. the fate of Sisyphus (*Od.* 11,593–600) and Ocnus (Pausanias 10,29,1.)

[45] Foley, *Homeric Hymn*, 63; see also Liddell & Scott, s.v.

[46] Richardson, *Homeric Hymn*, 310–11; Alderink, "Mythical and Cosmological Structure in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*," 8.

[47] Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 6. The fate of the initiated dead might have been imagined in materialistic terms. In Classical times, Hades was associated with Plouton, "the rich one," a god of fertility and agricultural abundance; see Clinton, *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, 59–63, 105–13. This new title recognized the beneficent powers of the god of the underworld. Garland, *Greek Way*, 53.

exceptional cases, but the benefits of the mysteries were potentially open to all mortals, regardless of sex, social status, etc.[48] Is this, then, an innovation? The hymn hardly constitutes a starting point for regarding the fate of the dead in more individual terms. It is more probable that it reflects beliefs that were already established in the mysteries. This means that, instead of a linear development from an "earlier" view to a "later" view, we are dealing with more or less contemporary ideas.[49] Moreover, even though the idea of a personal afterlife becomes stronger as time goes by, the belief in an undifferentiated fate for all the dead also emerges here and there.[50] The Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* and the emergence of the mystery cults in the seventh century show that the idea of personal rewards or punishments after death was known as early as the Archaic period, even though it is impossible to discern how widely held the view was.

Another indication of a more personal fate for the dead is the idea of metempsychosis, a doctrine usually credited to Pythagoras.[51] We have very little knowledge of Pythagoras himself who thus remains more like a mythical figure.[52] He is said to have left his native Samos and to have settled in Southern Italy. Curiously, other early thinkers who promoted the idea of metempsychosis, Parmenides and Empedocles, were also from Southern Italy.[53] Whatever the origins of the doctrine, the idea of the reincarnation of the soul implies that the

[48] Foley, *Homeric Hymn*, 144.

[49] It is impossible to know how much time there is between the traditions in the Homeric epics and those of the hymn. It is fair to assume that the hymn is based on older traditions. On the other hand, many scholars believe that the whole eleventh book of the Odyssey is a later addition; see Dawe, *Odyssey*, 428. For a different opinion, see Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 70–76. Be that as it may, the traditions behind the hymn may well be at least roughly contemporary with the epic view.

[50] E.g., Sophocles compares the souls to a swarm of bees: "And the dead in a swarm hum and rise up." (frg. 879; trans. Lloyd-Jones); Bremmer, "The Soul, Death, and the Afterlife in Early and Classical Greece," 101.

[51] Porphyry states that Pythagoras was the first to introduce the doctrine of reincarnation in Greece; *Vit. Pyth.* 19.

[52] The figure of Pythagoras has caused several disagreements among scholars, see the foreword in Navia, *Pythagoras: An Annotated Bibliography*: "He is either an identifiable historical figure whose life and doctrines can be adequately reconstructed, or a legendary creation of a variety of unreliable traditions, about whom nothing of substance can be said."

[53] Cf. Plato who associates the final eschatological myth in *Gorgias* with "some clever Italian or Sicilian" (*Gorg.* 495a). The position of Parmenides in this respect remains uncertain, cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 319. This means that the first clear witnesses to the doctrine of metempsychosis are Empedocles and Pindar. Cf. Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 19.

souls of the dead were no longer imagined as a collective. The idea of metempsychosis is easily connected with rewards and punishments: the form of the new life depends on the previous one. The doctrine of metempsychosis is associated with different mysteries, even though it never played a prominent part in them, and Plato uses it in his myths.[54]

One of the first witnesses to the idea of metempsychosis is Pindar. According to Plato, Pindar and other poets deem the soul immortal and believe that it is born again after death:

> But for those from whom Persephone accepts requital for the ancient grief,[55] in the ninth year she returns their souls to the upper sunlight; from them arise proud kings and men who are swift in strength and greatest in wisdom, and for the rest of time they are called sacred heroes by men. (Frg. 133.)[56]

Belief in metempsychosis is connected with otherworldly rewards and punishments in Pindar's second *Olympian Ode*, written for Theron of Acragas in 476 B.C.E. There, he first refers to the judgment of the "helpless spirits" that takes place beneath the earth where the dead must pay the penalty for sins committed on earth (2,57–60). The judgment is apparently given on moral grounds, based on how justly or unjustly the dead have lived their lives on earth.[57] The good and the wicked are strictly separated from each other. Pindar apparently describes three different fates after death (2,61–80).[58] The good (ἐσλοί)[59] spend a tearless existence with the gods in everlasting sunshine,[60] while those who have committed unjust deeds ". . . endure pain too

[54] Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 87. For a fuller treatment, see Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 120–65.

[55] For the different explanations on the meaning of the "ancient grief," see Willcock, *Victory Odes*, 173–74.

[56] The fragment is preserved in Plato's *Meno* 81b; trans. by Race.

[57] Graf, *Eleusis*, 86–87.

[58] Cf. the mysterious "three ways" of the dead in Pindar's frg. 129. Different interpretations of the meaning of these ways are presented by Willcock, *Pindar Victory Odes*, 171–72.

[59] A Doric form for ἐσθλοί. ἐσθλός is used much like ἀγαθός with the meaning "good," "brave" but also "rich," "wealthy," see Liddell & Scott, s.v. ἐσθλός. In his ode, Pindar praises the proper use of wealth for virtuous achievements (*Ol.* 2,51–56) and the term ἐσλοί can be taken as referring to wealth in the underworld much in a similar fashion to the term ὄλβιος in Hom. *Hymn Dem.* above.

[60] The idea of the dead joining gods is not far from the idea of the soul's divine origin and its return home at death—an idea explicitly stated in the gold leaves from the fourth century onwards (see further pp. 69–72 below); cf. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*, 359.

terrible to behold." The third fate is for those who have lived good lives through three cycles of life and who apparently receive the best reward, a place in the Isles of the Blessed (2,68–77). However, it is doubtful whether this is an option for ordinary mortals since all the inhabitants of the Isles of the Blessed mentioned by name are mythological figures: Peleus, Cadmus, and Achilles.[61] On the other hand, Pindar seems to suggest that Theron, his patron for whom the ode is written, is worthy of this reward.[62] The sharp distinction between the good and the wicked is also attested in several Pindaric fragments.[63] The life of the pious in Hades is complete happiness and delight in a sunny meadow with red roses and trees with golden fruit and a lovely fragrance, but the unholy and criminals are plunged into darkness.

### *Rewards and Punishments after Death*

Ideas of postmortem judgment and the alternative fates occur more regularly in sources from the fifth century onwards.[64] This seems to indicate an escalating shift in collective attitudes towards differentiated fates after death.[65] The fate of the dead is dependent either on the conduct of the individual during life or on initiation into mysteries.[66] However, life after death is only briefly alluded to in most sources; the only extensive description of Hades and rewards and punishments there is in Aristophanes' comedy the *Frogs*, written at the end of the fifth century B.C.E.[67] A comedy is naturally a tricky piece of

[61] In frg. 133, those souls that have been returned to the upper sunlight are also called "sacred heroes."

[62] Lloyd-Jones, "Pindar and the Afterlife," 259.

[63] The state of the blessed is described—or alluded to—in frgs. 129, 131a, 133, and 137, the destination of the wicked in frg. 130.

[64] Apart from Pindar, the earliest mentions of a postmortem judgment are in the plays of Aeschylus. In *Suppl.*, Danaus declares that those who have committed an impious act cannot escape divine wrath, not even in Hades; "There also, so men tell, among the dead another Zeus holds a last judgment upon misdeeds" (230–31; trans. Smyth). A similar view is also found in *Eum.* 269–75. Cf. Euripides *Alc.* 744–46; *Hel.* 1013–14. However, as the protagonists of the tragedies are mythical figures and heroes, it is not certain whether these references can be applied to the world of ordinary mortals. Cf. below, pp. 108–110.

[65] Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 353–54.

[66] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 18–19.

[67] For a recent discussion concerning the way Aristopahnes makes use of the traditional myth of an underworld journey, see Edmonds, *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic' Gold Tablets*, 111–58.

evidence but in order for the public to be able to laugh at the ridiculous scenes, it seems safe to assume that the play "... represents a basic minimum of common knowledge about the mysteries and their teachings concerning the land of the dead."[68]

In the play, Heracles gives Dionysos directions on how to get into the underworld. According to him, there is an enormous and deep lake in the underworld over which an old ferryman will row him for the payment of two obols. Dionysos will see there tens of thousands of great snakes and savage monsters and seas of filth and dung where those who have committed injustices are plunged. Next he will hear flutes and see sunshine over wonderful myrtle groves. That is the place where the mystic bands dwell (*Ran.* 136–58; cf. 450–59).

In the description, there seems to be a certain imbalance between the punishments and the rewards as the former are given on moral grounds while the latter are received through initiation. However, this imbalance is only apparent. First, the function of the afterlife scene is not to give a comprehensive account of the fate of the dead but to ridicule mysteries. That is why Aristophanes is not speculating on what happens to those who have led a virtuous life but are not initiated into mysteries. Second, we do not know whether the initiation was thought to be sufficient for attaining a blessed state after death or whether there were some moral demands associated with the mysteries.[69] Later, in sources from the Roman period, it is said of Diogenes the Cynic that he opposed the mysteries and refused to be initiated because he found it morally precarious that an initiated thief was guaranteed a better life after death than one who was virtuous but uninitiated.[70] The initiates themselves might have regarded this as an unfair criticism. It is plausible that they did not separate initiation and virtue but assumed that the initiates led virtuous lives.[71]

---

[68] Bernstein, *Formation*, 46. Cf. Edmonds, *Underworld Journey*, 113.

[69] Cf. Dover, "Commentary," 252; Richardson, "Early Greek Views," 58–59.

[70] Plutarch *Adol. poet. aud.* 21f.; Diogenes Laertius *Vit.* 6,39; cf. Foley, *Homeric Hymn*, 56.

[71] At least murderers were excluded from taking part in the mysteries; Mylonas, *Eleusis*, 247–48; Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 286–87. This, of course, is not an adequate proof of any moral requirements for initiation. However, the sources, which are often written from an outsider perspective, simply do not say what kind of an impact the initiation was thought to have on the life of the initiates. To view the initiation merely an external act without any deeper effect may underrate the role of the act in the initiates' lives.

In the descriptions of both Pindar and Aristophanes, all the dead, including those who dwell in eternal sunlight, seem to be in a subterranean abode.[72] In later sources, however, we get more and more references to a belief that the good souls ascend to the sky to join the immortal gods. Even though the earth receives their bodies, their souls are received by the air (αἰθέρ).[73] The origins of this kind of celestial or astral immortality are, again, obscure. Earlier it was often argued that the development in astronomy associated with Pythagoreanism forced a change in the beliefs in subterranean Hades to conform with the new scientific knowledge.[74] However, the idea that the soul is of divine origin and belongs to the world of the gods, i.e., to the sky, can be traced in some form to the time before Pythagoras and it developed in various directions.[75] Moreover, Pindar and Plato, who make use of a Pythagorean-type of eschatology, do not seem to have any completed system of astral immortality to work with.[76] The idea of identifying the blessed dead with the stars seems to have developed only gradually.[77] In the Hellenistic era, it became immensely popular among the major philosophical schools (aside from the Epicureans).[78] It allowed the combination of science and

[72] This is clear in Aristophanes' account. Pindar is more obscure. On the one hand, the good dwell in Hades beneath the earth (*Ol.* 2,59, frg. 129), on the other hand, they are with the gods (*Ol.* 2,65–66) who dwell on Mount Olympus (*Ol.* 2,12).

[73] Early evidence for this view is found in an epitaph for fallen Athenians at Potidaea from ca. 432 B.C.E.; see Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 361; Garland, *Greek Way*, 75. Literary examples are found in Euripides, e.g., *Hel.* 1013–6; *Or.* 1086–7. This is also a popular theme in many later epitaphs; Lattimore, *Themes*, 31–43; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 81–85; Avagianou calls it "a standard expression in funerary epigrams;" "Physiology and Mysticism at Pherai: The Funerary Epigram for Lykophoron," 75.

[74] E.g., Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, 142–56.

[75] Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 358–64. For example, in the thinking of the Ionian pre-Socratics, the microcosm (human being) reflected the macrocosm (the different portions of cosmos) and at death, the like was thought to return to like (soul to the stars, body to the earth). Souls were identified with stars as both were thought to be composed of the same matter, a kind of fire or heat. See Scott, *Origen and the Life of Stars: A History of an Idea*, 33.

[76] Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 364–66.

[77] The idea was closely related to the belief that stars were gods or other divine beings. On the development of this belief in philosophical speculations, see Scott, *Origen*, 3–75.

[78] Cf. Scott, *Origen*, 55. Astral immortality is also referred to in many epitaphs, see *Anth. Pal.* 7,62,64,391,669,670; Lattimore, *Themes*, 34–35; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 86–89.

religion, which made it appealing to various philosophers.[79] Thus, many Hellenistic descriptions conceive the status of humans differently from older accounts. While earlier a sharp distinction was made between the mortal and earth-bound humans and the immortal gods in heaven, in later sources the soul is immortal and belongs to the divine sphere.[80]

Belief in postmortem rewards and punishments is not limited to literature. An interesting source for the afterlife beliefs are texts inscribed on gold leaves and put into graves found in Southern Italy and Greece. These texts, often—but quite misleadingly—called "Orphic"[81] contain directions for the deceased on how to proceed in the hereafter.[82] Even though they are few in number, they are startlingly widely scattered.[83] Up to the present, twenty-one such texts have been published,[84] most of which have been dated to the fourth century B.C.E.[85]

The texts are of various types and are customarily divided into three main groups, often labeled A, B and P.[86] All of them imply

---

[79] According to Burkert, (*Lore and Science*, 368) especially the Stoics emphasized the agreement of science and religion and it "obviously made a tremendous impression on the Romans." However, one of the clearest examples of combining a scientific approach to a religious myth of the soul's journey in different astronomical spheres is found in Plutarch's treatise *De facie*. See Donini's article "Science and Metaphysics: Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism in Plutarch's *On the Face in the Moon*."

[80] Cf. Tabor, *Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Paradise in its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts*, 63–69.

[81] See further below, p. 80.

[82] The purpose of the leaves is not clear. Most scholars assume some kind of a ritual context for them, either initiation into mysteries or funeral; Graf, "Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology: New Texts and Old Questions," 247–50; Riedweg, "Initiation—Tod—Unterwelt: Beobachtungen zur Kommunikationssituation und narrativen Technik der orphisch-bakchischen Goldblättchen," 366–89.

[83] Zuntz emphasizes that, of the tens of thousands of investigated graves, the gold leaves have been found in only a few places; *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia*, 286. Even though the number of the places has more than doubled through new findings, Zuntz is correct in stating that "their use, then, was anything but common." However, the people with a gold leaf in their grave were hardly the only ones holding such afterlife beliefs. After all, gold was precious material and the graves containing these must have belonged to well-to-do people.

[84] See the list in Edmonds, *Underworld Journey*, 110.

[85] A most striking exception is leaf A 5 found in Rome, dated to the middle of the third century C.E., which makes it approximately 600 years later than the oldest text, B 10 from Hipponium.

[86] Zuntz divided the thirteen texts known to him into two groups, A and B; *Persephone,* 286. Of the more recent texts, most seem to belong to Group B but the two texts from Pelinna (Group P) share features typical of both former groups and

that there are different fates in the afterworld. No punishments are described but a better lot awaits the bearers of the leaves. For the first time, mortals claim that they will become like gods or will rest with the immortals.[87] This claim is based on the purity of the deceased, perhaps attained by initiation or other cultic act. An example of this is text A1, found in Thurii and dated to the fourth century B.C.E.:

> From the pure I come, being pure myself, Queen of the dead
> Eucles, Eubouleus and other immortal gods.[88]
> For I claim that I too belong to your blessed race,
> But I was doomed by destiny or the thrower of the thunderbolt.[89]
> I escaped from the painful cycle,[90]
> I gained the victor's crown with swift feet,
> I fled into the bosom of the Queen of the dead.
> "O blessed and happy one, you will become a god instead of a mortal."
> A kid has fallen into milk.[91]

Other texts formulate both the appeal of the deceased for special treatment and the final state of the blessed dead somewhat differently but all the gold leaves declare that the deceased are of divine origin and will enjoy a happy afterlife.[92]

---

show that the boundaries between the two groups are not fixed, see Graf, "Dionysian," 250–51. The different texts may go back to a common archetype, see the attempts for a reconstruction of such an archetype in West, "Zum neuen Goldblättchen aus Hipponion," 235–36 and Janko "Forgetfulness in the Golden Tablets of Memory," 98–100. Lately, many scholars have emphasized the oral transmission of the texts, Janko, "Forgetfulness," 90; Graf, "Dionysian," 247; Riedweg, "Initiation," 362–63.

[87] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 12–13.

[88] Eucles and Eubouleus are euphemistic names for chthonic gods but it is not quite clear to which deities the names refer. Eubouleus was one of the deities worshipped in the Eleusinian mysteries; Graf, *Eleusis*, 171–72. According to Edmonds (*Underworld Journey*, 59–60), the name may be an epithet of Dionysos.

[89] Zuntz believes that this line indicates that the buried ones were actually killed by lightning; *Persephone*, 316. This, however, is far from certain. Others maintain that the line identifies the dead person with Titans who were destroyed by Zeus' thunderbolt; Graf, "Dionysian," 253–54. In some other myths, lightning was associated with the apotheosis of mortal beings, such as Herakles, Semele, and Asclepius; see Edmonds, *Underworld Journeys*, 73–75.

[90] According to Zuntz, this line refers clearly to metempsychosis and points to a Pythagorean origin; *Persephone*, 320–21. Newer finds, however, have proved the gold leaves to belong to a Dionysian context; Graf, "Dionysian," 239. However, the emphasis on Mnemosyne in many other gold leaves may indicate some kind of a doctrine of metempsychosis; Edmonds, *Underworld Journeys*, 54.

[91] On this obscure formulation; see Graf, "Dionysian," 245–47.

[92] In A 2 and 3, the deceased affirms that "I paid penalty for wrongful deeds." The texts of Group P state most interestingly: "Say to Persephone that Bakchios himself has released you." These may imply, as Bremmer (*Rise and Fall*, 22) concludes, that the dead can enter the abode of the blessed only after atonement (prob-

The geography and conditions of the underworld are described in the texts of Group B. The oldest one of these is text B 10, found in Hipponium and dated to the late fifth or early fourth century B.C.E.[93] The text runs as follows:[94]

> In the house of Hades there is[95] on the right a spring; by it stands a white cypress. Here the descending souls of the dead cool themselves. Do not even go near this spring! Further on you will find cool water flowing from the lake of Memory; guardians stand over it. They will ask you in (their) sagacious mind what you are inquiring in the gloom of the darkest Hades.[96] Say: "I am a son of Earth and starry Heaven. I am dry with thirst and perishing; give quickly cool water to drink from the lake of Memory." The kings of the underworld will question you[97] and they will give you to drink from the lake of Memory. And surely, after the drinking, you will also go the sacred way which also other *mystai* and *bacchoi* walk in fame.

ably by initiation). The texts of Group B, however, make the plea merely on the basis of the divine origin of the deceased: "I am a son/child/daughter of Earth and starry Heaven." It is clear that most dead are not considered as being of divine origin (see text B 10 below), only those who know the right words (the initiates?) The fate of the blessed is also described in various ways. A 2 and A 3 speak of "the seats of the blessed," while A 4 declares (as A 1 above) ". . . you have become a god." P 1 assures that ". . . an end awaits you under the earth such as the rest of the blessed have." Most of the texts of Group B are not explicit, but the Petalia text (B 1) promises that ". . . you will rule with the other heroes."

[93] Graf, "Dionysian," 239.

[94] I follow the text given in Riedweg, "Initiation," 395–96. The beginning of the text poses problems; it is "barely intelligible and probably corrupt," as Burkert (*Greek Religion*, 293) puts it, and is omitted in my translation. It probably gives instructions concerning the use of the text; Janko, "Forgetfulness," 92. A similar addendum is in the end of B 1 and most probably also in the beginning of B 11.

[95] All the other long texts in Group B (B 1, B 2, B 11) begin with an address to the deceased: "You will find . . ." (εὑρήσεις). The inscriber has seemingly confused the verb and understood it as an epithet εὐηρής, "well-fitted". This adjective, however, is only used of oars in Homer. As there is no verb left, an impersonal ἔστι has been added, which wrecks the meter of both this and the subsequent lines, as the words κρήνα and κυπάρισσος must have been put into the nominative. For details, see Janko, "Forgetfulness," 92.

[96] The last word is irrecoverable, only the letters ο[..]εεντος survive. B 11 has ὀρφ{ο}νήεντο<ς>.

[97] Riedweg gives the line: καὶ δή τοι ἐρεοῦσιν ὑποχθονίωι βασιλεί<αι>. Janko ("Forgetfulness," 96) takes it as καὶ δή τοί σ' ἐλεοῦσιν ὑποχθονίοι βασιλῆες and translates: "The kings of the underworld take pity on you;" cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 293. West ("Zum neuen Goldblättchen," 233) suggests the form καὶ δή τοὶ τελέουσι σ' ὑποχθονίωι βασιλείαι, cf. Bremer ("Death and Immortality in Some Greek Poems," 121) who translates: "They will actually initiate you into the mysteries of the queen of the netherworld."

What matters in this text (as in all texts in Group B) is that the deceased must remember the right way and speak the right words in order to receive the blessed fate. The knowledge of the way and of the words is obtained by initiation—the fate of the μύσται and βάκχοι is different from the rest of the mortals.

By the time of Plato, then, the idea of a postmortem judgment and differentiation of fates thereupon were readily available. Plato uses these ideas in several eschatological myths (*Gorg.* 523a–527e; *Phaed.* 113d–114c; *Resp.* 10,614b–621d; cf. also *Phaedr.* 246b–249d).[98] The most important function of these myths is to convince the hearers of the superiority of the virtuous life. This is especially evident in the final myth of the *Gorgias*. According to its description, the judgment after death takes place in a meadow where three paths meet. Along one of them, the dead arrive from this world to the place of judgment, the other two lead to the Isles of the Blessed and Tartarus, respectively. Those souls that are found virtuous—they are those who have lived the life of a philosopher—are sent to the Isles of the Blessed to live forever happy, but the souls of the sinners are sent to Tartarus to suffer what befits them. The suffering benefits only those souls whose sins are curable. Their injustice is atoned for by the punishment. Plato is not explicit what happens to these purified souls but apparently they are released from Tartarus after paying the penalty. Some of the wicked souls, of those who were extremely injust, have become incurable. They are locked up in Tartarus forever to serve as warning examples for others.[99] The judgment scene in the afterlife corresponds to this life and the myth reinforces Socrates' teaching according to which it is always more advantageous to do good than to do evil, even if it means suffering injustice.[100]

[98] For an analysis of the different myths, their similarities, and differences, see Annas, "Plato's Myths of Judgement," 122–38.

[99] A corresponding description is found in the *Phaedo* (113d–114c). According to it, the dead are divided into the good, the bad and those who are neither. The last mentioned ones are purified in the Acherusian lake. They pay penalties for their wrongdoings and receive rewards for their good deeds, all according to their merits. The curable and the incurable sinners are taken into Tartarus from whence only the former are released. The virtuous souls are freed from the underworld. They ascend and dwell upon the earth. The most excellent of them, those who have purified themselves by philosophy will live without bodies and pass to "still more beautiful abodes which it is not easy to describe." See Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic*, 79–111; Edmonds, *Underworld Journey*, 171–219.

[100] Also the other eschatological myths apparently serve to reinforce the right way to live. As Annas has pointed out, however, the introduction of reincarnation

An even more elaborate description of the conditions in the afterlife is in the final myth of the *Republic*. It tells of the otherworldly journey of a Pamphylian hero, Er, who apparently dies in battle.[101] Ten days later, his corpse is found intact and on the twelfth day, when he is put on a funerary pyre, he comes back to life and tells of his experiences. He describes how his soul, after leaving his body, arrives with many others at a mysterious region where judges sit in a meadow between two openings in the earth and two in heaven. Upon judgment, the souls are sent through one of the openings, the just souls to the right upwards, the unjust souls to the left downwards, to spend a thousand years either in the pleasantness of heaven or in terrible torments below. As in other Platonic accounts, here the incurably wicked souls are also locked into Tartarus. After rewards and punishments, the souls come back to the meadow through the other openings; those who descend from the heaven are clean, while those who ascend from beneath are completely dusty. There they spend a week's time and tell each other about their experiences. Then they are led to the Moirai to receive lots for choosing a new life. Ironically, those whose former life on earth has been decent and who accordingly have enjoyed a pleasant stay in the otherworld, choose lives of tyrants, while those who have been frightened by their unpleasant experiences are careful to choose modest lives. After choosing, the souls have to drink from the river of oblivion to forget their previous lives.[102] Then the souls fall asleep and are carried to their births.

---

blurs this moral teaching; "Plato's myths," 126–29 and 131–37. This is especially evident in the case of *Resp.*

[101] According to Culianu, the vision of Er is based on an actual ecstatic experience of a cataleptic; *Psychanodia I: A Survey of the Evidence Concerning the Ascension of the Soul and Its Relevance*, 39. This, however, is far from being certain. The vision of Er has literary counterparts, e.g., in Persian sources, but the question of the origins of Plato's description remains unsolved; see Halliwell, "Commentary," 169–70.

[102] The choosing of the next life includes a paradox. The choosing is based on the memory of the previous life (and the subsequent punishment and reward) but the chosen life is lived without any memory of the choice and other happenings in the otherworld. It may be asked, with Halliwell ("Introduction," 21–22) does this not exclude all possibility of an individual soul progressing towards justice and freedom from the cycle of rebirth? Annas ("Plato's Myths," 132–33) goes even further and asks, if the moral quality of one's life and its results are determined by previous lives which cannot be remembered, is it just to receive punishments for crimes and injustices that are thus out of one's own control? Of the ancient authors Lucian treats this paradox in his *Dial. mort.* 24.

If we compare Plato's description to that of Homer and Hesiod, we can see how greatly the idea of the afterlife has changed over the course of the centuries. Even though Plato uses Homeric concepts, such as Tartarus, underworld rivers,[103] and an underworld meadow,[104] they have received a different function. No longer are only mythical figures locked up in the depths of Tartarus but all incurable sinners. The rivers and the chasms not only separate the world of the dead from the world of the living but also have punitive functions. Already in Homer, there is a judge in the afterworld, Minos. However, he is not the judge of the dead but continues his earthly occupation. Because Minos was a judge on earth, he goes on judging in the afterworld.[105] In Plato, however, the judges have a vital role in sending the dead to their respective destinies. The idea of alternative afterlives—pleasant for the good souls, gruesome for the wicked—is far from Homer's cheerless existence equally for all the dead. The idea of reincarnation is also novel. Whatever the models Plato had for his composition[106] and whatever he himself thought of the myths,[107] their impact on subsequent accounts was

[103] In *Il.* 23,71–74 the river is not named, in *Il.* 8,369 it is called the Styx. In *Od.* 10,508–15, there are multiple rivers, Oceanus, Acheron, Pyriphlegethon, Cocytus, and Styx. Their basic function seems to be to separate the world of the dead from that of the living. In Plato, the otherworldly rivers bear the same names but they are not neutral boundaries. The waters of these rivers do not mix and they all have their own function. Those who have lived a moderate life will sail along the Acheron to the Acherusian Lake where they are cleansed. The other rivers flow from Tartarus where all those are taken who have committed serious crimes and have not repented. When they have been cleansed there, a surge will throw them out, those who have committed homicide along the Cocytus, those guilty of patricide or matricide along the Pyriphlegethon (*Phaed.* 112e–114c.)

[104] Cf. *Od.* 11,539; 24,13.

[105] Willcock, *Victory Odes*, 155.

[106] The Platonic myths are often called "orphic-pythagorean," see Graf, *Eleusis*, 88; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 91–92. Cf. Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy*, 88–95 and 112–32.

[107] According to Burkert, Plato tells about divine things only "at the playful level of myth;" *Greek Religion*, 325. According to Bauckham, on the other hand, Plato used the myths to express his own understanding of the fate of the soul; "Descents to the Underworld," 29. As the different eschatological myths contradict each other in detail, it seems clear that Plato did not intend them as literal descriptions of the hereafter. However, the myths have a prominent place, usually at the end of a dialogue (*Phaed.*, *Resp.*), which indicates that Plato wanted them to be taken seriously. See the discussion concerning the relationship between *logos* and *mythos* in Plato; Edmonds, *Underworld Journey*, 161–71. Cf. the discussion concerning Plutarch on pp. 92–93.

remarkable.[108] Most later allusions to—or whole descriptions of—the afterlife bear a resemblance to the imagery used by Plato.[109]

## *The Question of "Orphic Influence"*

Was this change due to Orphism? Even though the term "Orphic" is frequently used in scholarly works, it is not at all clear what is meant by it. Earlier scholarship tended to see "Orphism" as an organized cult with clearly defined doctrines, its own rituals, and theological writings,[110] but many of the more recent treatments are less confident.[111] If "Orphism" is defined at all, it is a "climate of opinion" or "structure of thought" with some particular discernible traits.[112] The difficulty of determining what "Orphism" actually is, is mostly due to ambivalent sources[113] that use the term "Orphic" in three different ways: in association with literature, rites, and a way of life.[114]

Orpheus was a mythical poet to whom several poems were ascribed.[115] Several sources refer to "Orphic" books and poems and we know of several Orphic theogonies.[116] The term "Orphic" is also

---

[108] An interesting early follower of Plato was the fourth century B.C.E. philosopher Heraclides Ponticus whose works only survive in fragments. These are collected in Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, see esp. frgs. 90–98. According to Plutarch, the works of Heraclides contained a treatise entitled *On the things in Hades* (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου) The surviving fragments allow us to know that he envisioned three different doors and three ways (leading to different destinies?) in Hades (frg. 94) and that the Milky Way served as a path for the souls into heaven (frgs. 96–97). See further Wehrli, "Herakleides Pontikos," 679–80; Attridge, "Greek and Latin Apocalypses," 163.

[109] See, e.g., the afterlife myths of Virgil, Cicero, Pseudo-Plato, and Plutarch below pp. 82–83 and 87–96.

[110] Rohde, *Psyche 2*, 111–13; Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 476–77; Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, 243–50; Boulanger, *Orphée: Rapports de l'orphisme et du christianisme*, 28–29; Guthrie, *The Greeks and Their Gods*, 309.

[111] One of the early critics of the older view was von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf; see *Glaube* 2, 182–204. Another important contribution to the more critical view is Linforth's *The Arts of Orpheus*, see pp. 169–71, 266, 275–76, 304–206. See also West, *The Orphic Poems*, 2–3, Brisson, "Les théogonies Orphiques et le papyrus de Derveni: notes critiques," 411; Edmonds, *Underworld Journey*, 37–46.

[112] Alderink, *Creation and Salvation in Ancient Orphism*, 82.

[113] Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 296.

[114] Cf. Burkert, "Craft Versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans," 3–4.

[115] Linforth, *Arts of Orpheus*, 166–68; West, *Orphic Poems*, 3. However, whereas Linforth thinks that the poems were widely read and quoted, West claims (pp. 79–80) that they had only a very limited circulation and were not of general public interest.

[116] Plato speaks of prophets (μάντεις) who "produce a throng of books of Orpheus

used to describe different rituals. The sources attest, then, the view that there never was one single phenomenon that could be called "Orphic."[117] The rituals were not necessarily connected with each other or with the poems.[118] "Orphics" or "Orpheotelests" (Ὀρφεοτελεσταί) were "itinerant initiation priests" who ". . . performed initiations according to the teachings of Orpheus."[119] It seems likely, however, that there were no communities around these τελεσταί, as often assumed in earlier scholarship.[120] Those initiated into "Orphic" rites were probably known for their lifestyle, which seems to have included abstinence from animal sacrifices and eating meat.[121]

Moreover, "Orphic" is often used in the sources in association with "Pythagorean" and "Bacchic."[122] Scholars have stressed both the close interrelation between "Orphic" and Pythagorean,[123] and

---

and Musaeus" (*Resp.* 2,364e). Euripides refers to people who have Orpheus as their lord, perform Bacchic rites and revere many books (*Hipp.* 953–54). A helpful survey of Orphic literature is in West, *Orphic Poems*, 7–38.

[117] In the words of West (*Orphic Poems*, 3), "Orphics are simply people who in their religious beliefs or practices, whatever these may be, accord a place of honour to texts ascribed to Orpheus." West acknowledges Linforth for this view, whose approach is deemed "hypercritical" by Graf, *Eleusis*, 185; cf. Edmonds, *Underworld Journeys*, 228, n. 7. The latter suggests that the definition "Orphic" might be extended to include materials that "appeal to a source of authority [other than Orpheus] that contradicts the mainstream tradition."

[118] West, *Orphic Poems*, 3.

[119] Burkert, "Craft Versus Sect," 4.

[120] An exception to this might be offered by the three bone tablets found in Olbia, a Greek colony by the Black Sea; see West, "The Orphics of Olbia." One of them has both the word Ὀρφικοι and the name Διο(νυσος) inscribed in it but "any interpretation is hazardous as long as the function of these plates has not been established," as Burkert puts it; "Craft Versus Sect," 12. His own guess is that "among the worshippers of Dionysus one group, possibly adherents of one *telestes*, set themselves apart by their faith in the authority of Orpheus, and were thus called *Orphikoi*." This was probably not a common way to understand the term: "It is hardly a coincidence that this evidence comes from the utmost margin of the Greek world."

[121] Plato (*Leg.* 6,782c) speaks of people who lead "a kind of Orphic life, as it is called." See Linforth, *Arts of Orpheus*, 97–98. Cf. also Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 635e.

[122] This is the case already in the earliest literary mention of "Orphics." In discussing Egyptian customs, Herodotus (2,81) states that the white woolen outer garments worn by the Egyptians are not buried with the dead and continues: "In this they agree with the customs which are called Orphic and Bacchic, though they are in fact Egyptian and Pythagorean."

[123] Plato, for one, reports that Pythagorean ideas were taught in association with the Orphic mysteries (*Leg.* 870de). It is customary to speak of "Orphic-Pythagorean" beliefs, without distinguishing the two; see, e.g., Graf, *Eleusis*, 92–94; Lloyd-Jones, "Pindar," 265.

the affinity of "Orphic" and Bacchic.[124] Curiously, both Pythagorean and many so-called Orphic eschatological ideas seem to emerge from Southern Italy,[125] which is also where the Bacchic mysteries seem to have developed.[126] It may be asked, whether there is any means—or indeed any sense—in trying to distinguish "Orphic" from the other two.[127]

In the light of all this, do we have any grounds for speaking about "Orphic eschatology" or "Orphic influence" on the concepts of the afterlife? I would answer in the negative.[128] Both formulations still seem to imply the outdated conception of an "Orphic" sect with some kind of a definable doctrine.[129] It is undeniable that the Orphic poems contained eschatological ideas—this is evident from the fragments we know of the Orphic theogonies—but the assumed "Orphic" origin of these beliefs is well worth questioning.

The destiny of humans after death is referred to in the so-called Rhapsodic theogony, the most widespread Orphic poem, especially in Roman times.[130] West reconstructs:

---

[124] Strabo (10,3,23) speaks of "the Dionysiac and Orphic arts," cf. Euripides, *Hipp.* 953–54 (see n. 116 above.) Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 294; Bremmer, *Greek Religion*, 86.

[125] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 107.

[126] Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 22.

[127] Burkert offers a dissenting opinion; *Greek Religion*, 300:

> Bacchic, Orphic, and Pythagorean are circles each of which has its own centre, and while these circles have areas that coincide, each preserves its own special sphere. [. . .] Within the sphere of *Orphica*, two schools may perhaps be distinguished, an Athenian-Eleusinian school which concentrated on the bestowal of culture allegedly to be found in the Demeter myth and the Eleusinian mysteries, and an Italian, Pythagorean school which took a more original path with the doctrine of the transmigration of the souls. Orphic and Bacchic coincide in their concern for burial and the afterlife and probably also in the special myth of Dionysos Zagreus, while Orphic and Pythagorean coincide in the doctrine of metempsychosis and asceticism. However that may be, the difficulties of precise demarcation should not lead to a denial of the phenomena themselves.

But if "Orphica" can thus be split into two—one Bacchic half, the other Pythagorean half—what original "Orphic" remains?

[128] Thus also Edmonds, *Underworld Journey*, 103, 227–28.

[129] Cf. the recent definition by Bremmer (*Greek Religion*, 86): "Around 500 B.C. a new religious "movement" arose in Southern Italy, which distributed its ideas in the form of poems ascribed to Orpheus." The quotation marks seem to imply that we should not take the word "movement" in a strict sense, yet it is hard to avoid the impression that there was an identifiable group of people with their own doctrine. Bernstein (*Formation*, 43–46) speaks even more bluntly of "the Orphic religion" and Segal (*Life after Death*, 220–21) uses without difficulty terms such as "Orphism" and "the Orphics."

[130] West, *Orphic Poems*, 69.

> Though their [the living creatures'] bodies are mortal, their souls are immortal, drawn from the air, and passing through a series of human and animal bodies. When a soul leaves an animal's body, it floats around until another one catches it off the wind; but when it leaves a human body, Hermes leads it below the earth. There it is judged: the good have a better fate, going to the meadow by Acheron and the misty lake, while the wicked are led to Tartarus and the plain of Cocytus. The Styx is also to be found there, a branch of Oceanus and one of its ten parts. A god that swears falsely upon it is punished in Tartarus for nine thousand years. Souls spend three hundred years in the otherworld and then are reborn. But their aim is to achieve release from the round of misery.[131]

This clearly corresponds to the eschatological myths of Plato and other similar accounts. The problem, however, is the late dating; the Rhapsodic theogony derives perhaps only from the first century B.C.E.[132] It is certain that other Orphic poems were known centuries earlier, as attested by the so-called Derveni papyrus[133] but we do not know whether they contained any eschatological ideas. The surviving parts of the Derveni papyrus do not contain any.[134] As the evidence points in the direction that "Orphic" is related to mysteries, such as those ascribed to Dionysus and Demeter,[135] it is not at all certain in which direction the influence went: from "Orphic" to the mysteries or from the mysteries to "Orphic."[136]

This skepticism gains strength when those passages that are usually taken as evidence of "Orphic eschatology" are studied. In none of them is the name "Orpheus" or "Orphic" mentioned. For example, Plato's *Meno* 81b—a text called a "summation of Orphic eschatology"[137]—speaks of those who ". . . say that the soul of man is immor-

---

[131] West, *Orphic Poems*, 75.

[132] West, *Orphic Poems*, 248–51.

[133] The papyrus contains a commentary to an Orphic poem and is dated approximately 500 B.C.E.; Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 296; West, *Orphic Poems*, 81–82; cf. 75–77. The content of the papyrus is published in *ZPE* 47 (1982), 301–12.

[134] West assumes that the poem that is cited in the Derveni papyrus is based on a lengthier poem that he calls the Protogonos theogony; *Orphic Poems*, 69. In his view, both these early theogonies contained the idea of a postmortem judgment and of metempsychosis; *Orphic Poems* 101. This, however, is speculation, since there is no evidence.

[135] According to Brisson, the name of Orpheus is associated in one way or another with the best known mysteries of Greco-Roman antiquity; *Orphée et l'Orphisme dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*, 1. Later, the Homeric hymn to Demeter was also ascribed to Orpheus; West, *Orphic Poems*, 24.

[136] Brisson, *Orphée*, 2.

[137] Graf, "Dionysian," 242.

tal, sometimes reaching an end which men call dying, sometimes born again, but never perishing."[138] But these people are not associated with Orpheus. They are "men and women who are wise in things divine" some of whom were "priests and priestesses who wanted to explain their observances" but also "Pindar and as many other poets who are inspired." Orpheus, however, is not mentioned.

Similarly, in another passage in the *Republic*, Plato refers to the postmortem fate of the just and the unjust (2,363c–e). The just will participate in a "symposium of the saints" (συμπόσιον τῶν ὁσίων) in "everlasting drunkenness" (μέθην αἰώνιον). The unjust are buried in mud and compelled to carry water in a sieve. Plato does not attribute this view to Orpheus but to "Musaeus and his son." Musaeus, "he of the muses" was a mythical singer who was considered one of the earliest poets, later than Orpheus but earlier than Homer and Hesiod.[139] He was imagined as the father of Eumolpus, the eponym of the Eleusinian hierophants, the Eumolpidae.[140] This clearly connects the eschatological view Plato refers to with the Eleusinian mysteries. The fact that Plato further along speaks of "books of Musaeus and Orpheus" (2,364e; cf. above n. 116), or that Plutarch, roughly four hundred years later, associates the doctrine of "eternal drunkenness" with τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ὀρφέα (*Comp. Cim. Luc.* 521b), or that, in the first century B.C.E., Musaeus was called Orpheus' son (Diod. Sic. 4,25,1) does not make the passage an example of "Orphic eschatology."[141]

The same holds true for other passages taken as representatives of "Orphic eschatology," such as Pindar *Ol.* 2,57–68, frgs. 129, 130, 131a, 133, 137, Sophocles frg. 837, Aristophanes *Ran.* 448–455, and Plutarch frg. 178. There is nothing in them that would relate them with "Orpheus" or "Orphic." If there is some connection with an initiation, it is to the Eleusinian mysteries, as in the Sophoclean fragment (cited on p. 63 above) and one of the Pindaric fragments

[138] Trans. R.E. Allen.
[139] West, *Orphic Poems*, 40.
[140] Graf, *Eleusis*, 17–20.
[141] To treat it as such can be called "a remarkable instance of arguing in a circle," see Zuntz, *Persephone*, 337, n. 5. Neither does the famous play on words of the body (σῶμα) being a prison (σῆμα) of the soul reported by Plato (*Crat.* 400 b) and ascribed to οἱ ἀμφὶ Ὀρφέα add to our understanding of "Orphic eschatology." All that the passage reveals is that the Orphic poets regarded the body as a deposit (σῶμα) for the soul while it is undergoing punishment, punishment being a life *within* the body. Nothing is said of any otherworldly punishments.

(frg. 137).[142] Why then are these texts "Orphic" and not "Eleusinian"? The same applies to the gold leaves: none of them refer to Orpheus or Orphic. Thus there is no basis to call them "Orphic," as is often done.[143] Instead, some of the gold leaves clearly show that they were used in Bacchic mysteries.[144]

However, to speak of "Bacchic eschatology" is no less problematic, since there was no single "cult of Dionysus," either.[145] There were a variety of different local Bacchic cults that differed greatly from each other with no central shrine and priesthood or canonical books.[146] Like Orpheus, Dionysus was a many-sided cultic figure, also associated with the underworld.[147] One feature of his multifaceted cult was the promise of a happy afterlife.[148]

On the basis of this rather lengthy discussion, it seems best to stop using the term "Orphic eschatology" altogether as it too easily evokes the outdated picture of an organized movement with a defined set of doctrines. The idea of personal rewards and punishments after death seems connected first and foremost with different kinds of mysteries. There was no one ("Orphic" or another) outside influence that produced this view but the beginning of the belief in differentiated postmortem fates is already seen in the early myths.

---

[142] The fragment is preserved in *Stromata* 3,17 by Clement of Alexandria. He connects the quotation from Pindar ("Blessed is the one who sees them and goes beneath the earth . . .") with the Eleusinian mysteries. It remains somewhat unclear whether Pindar was speaking of the mysteries or whether the connection was made by Clement. The former seems more probable, as the quotation resembles closely the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* (quoted above on pp. 62) and the fragment of Sophocles. In the Plutarchian fragment (frg. 178), the blessed afterlife is awaiting those who have undergone initiation into great mysteries. Cf. Ar. *Ran.* 448–55.

[143] West, *Orphic Poems*, 26; Zuntz, *Persephone*, 318.

[144] Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 293–95; Graf, "Dionysian," 244–45. See the text of the Hipponium leaf above pp. 71.

[145] Heinrichs, "Changing Dionysiac Identities," 151–52.

[146] The Bacchic mysteries were not bound to a fixed place or sanctuary like the Eleusinian mysteries, for example, but could be celebrated anywhere where there were adherents to the cult; Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 291. There were also no restrictions based on ethnicity, gender, or age. See Heinrichs, "Changing," 137–39.

[147] Cole, "New Evidence," 234–37; Heinrichs, "Changing," 137; Couliano, *Expériences de l'exstase: Exstace, ascension et récit visionnaire de l'Hellénisme au Moyen Âges*, 81–82.

[148] Heinrichs, "Changing," 160; Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 21–22.

## 5.3. Concepts of the Afterlife in Hellenistic and Roman Times

Whatever the history of the ideas concerning the afterlife, by Hellenistic and Roman times, there was a diversity of beliefs concerning post-mortem fate.[149] The fate of the soul after death was a popular theme for both poets and philosophers. The traditional Homeric terminology was used but often with a different meaning that reflected later beliefs. Elysium, for example, was located both in the underworld and in the sky, on the moon or other faraway place. Common to all these descriptions was that the world of the dead was remote from the world of the living.[150] Correspondingly, the happy existence after death was depicted in several different ways, either as being in Elysium or the Isles of the Blessed, or living in the air, as a star, in heaven, or on Olympus with the immortal gods.[151]

The connection of a blessed afterlife with initiation was continued in some circles. In addition to the old mysteries connected with Demeter and Dionysus,[152] new so-called Oriental mystery cults, such as those associated with Isis, Magna Mater, and Mithras came to the fore. The main emphasis of these cults seems to be on worldly matters; their benefits were first and foremost connected with saving from illnesses, dangerous seafaring and other suffering in this life.[153] Yet, a happy afterlife was connected with these, not least because those dead who were somehow disturbed affected the well-being of the living.[154] Many people wanted to secure their future by initiation. According to Plutarch, it was the belief of some people that ". . . some initiations and purifications will help: once purified, they will go on playing and dancing in Hades in places with sunlight,

[149] Cf. Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 7; Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists," 277. The latter makes the point that even though scholars have become aware of the diversity within the New Testament, they fail to see a similar diversity in the surrounding Hellenistic culture.

[150] Lattimore, *Themes*, 40–42.

[151] This diversity is clearly seen in epitaphs; cf. Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 106–21, 180–81.

[152] On Bacchic mysteries in the Hellenistic age, see Burkert, "Bacchic Teletai in the Hellenistic Age," esp. pp. 261–70.

[153] The afterlife dimension in the so-called Oriental cults is less explicit than often assumed, see Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 25–29. It is mostly denied by MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire*, 53–57. Cf. Smith, *Drudgery*, 125–29.

[154] See the discussion of Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, 12–29. Cf. Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 80–81.

pure air and sound of voices" (*Suav. viv.* 1105b).[155] In another text, Plutarch consoles his wife on the death of their two-year old daughter by reminding her of soul's imperishability, knowledge which they share with other participants in the Dionysiac rites (*Cons. ux.* 611d–e).

The most exhaustive and detailed treatment of the afterlife in poetry is offered by the "Roman Homer" Virgil[156] who dedicated a whole book to describing the conditions of Hades. The sixth book of the *Aeneid* relates Aeneas' journey to the netherworld to meet his father. Virgil draws heavily on Homer, especially from the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*, but freely alters the Homeric concepts and scenes to correspond to the currents of his own time.[157] For example, he describes the geography of the netherworld by using traditional terminology, such as Erebus, Tartarus and Elysium, Lake Acheron (Avernus), and the rivers Styx, Cocytos and Phlegethon. The key figures also stem from his tradition. The netherworld is ruled by Pluto and his queen Proserpine (Persephone), Charon takes the dead over in his ferry, Cerberus guards the dead, Minos and Rhadamanthys preside as judges, the Furies punish the wicked. However, the geography of the netherworld is more developed than in the earlier accounts. At the entrance, Aeneas meets the souls of all who have suffered an untimely death: infants, those who have been condemned to die on a false charge, those who have committed suicide. A special group among the latter is the victims of love. These shades remain at the portal of Hades until they have fulfilled what would have been their normal lifetime, after which Minos admits them into the inner parts.[158] Further away dwell those who have been renowned in war. This part of the netherworld, then, seems to be neutral ground with no punishments or special rewards.

---

[155] Cf. *Fac.* 943c; Ps.-Plato, *Ax.* 370d. Plutarch associates the initiation with the fear of otherworldly punishments, which he scorns.

[156] Contemporaries of Virgil compared the *Aeneid* to the Homeric epics. Propertius (2,34,65) wrote concerning it: "Make way, ye Roman authors, clear the street O ye Greeks, For a much larger Iliad is in the course of construction" (trans. Ezra Pound). On the relationship between the two poets, see Knauer, "Virgil and Homer," esp. 877–81.

[157] For details, see Lehtipuu, "The Imagery of the Lukan Afterworld in the Light of Some Roman and Greek Parallels," 138–42.

[158] All these dead are already in Hades; Aeneas meets them after he has crossed the Acheron. On the other side of the water remain those who have not been properly buried. They must roam about for a hundred years. Thus Virgil retains the traditional Homeric idea that only the buried are allowed into Hades.

Still further on, the road splits: the right path leads to Elysium, the land of joy where the pious souls are, the left one to Tartarus where the wicked are punished. Aeneas is not allowed to visit Tartarus but he can see the grim citadel encircled by the fiery river and hear the groans and cries of the tortured. These include mythical figures[159] but also ordinary people, all

> . . . those who in life hated their own brothers, or struck their parents; those who entangled their dependants in fraudulent dealing; and those who sat tight on the wealth they had won, setting none aside for their own kin—most numerous of all are these; then such as were killed for adultery, took part in military treason, men who were bold to break faith with their masters—all such await punishment (6,608–14).

The pious souls are taken to Elysium, a fertile, delightful and happy place where they spend their time there wrestling, dancing, chanting, and feasting while Orpheus plays his lyre (6,638–47).

Thus Virgil combines the "neutral" Homeric view with a thoroughly "moral" view of death[160] where the destiny of the deceased is based on their earthly lives. Only a few souls, however, as a reward for their virtues, are allowed to stay in the Elysian fields until the wheel of time is complete. After this period, these chosen few become the pure flame of air which they were before they entered into the wheel of birth. As for the vast majority of the souls, they spend a thousand years in the underworld, then drink from the river Lethe, and undergo a rebirth on earth—a clear imitation of Plato's account in the *Republic*.

### *Philosophical Treatments of the Fate of the Soul*

The fate of the soul after death was a theme also treated in philosophical writings. The most influential philosophical systems in Hellenistic period were the Stoics, the Skeptics, the Epicureans and the Platonists (or Middle-Platonists).[161] The opinions concerning the soul and its postmortem fate varied greatly both among these schools and

[159] Of the traditional mythical criminals, only Tityus is named but the punishments suffered by Tantalus and Sisyphus are also described, even though their names are not mentioned; *Aen.* 6,595–607, 616.

[160] The terms "neutral death" and "moral death" are from Bernstein, *Formation*, 3, 72, and *passim*.

[161] An invaluable guide to these is the two-volume introduction and commentary *The Hellenistic Philosophers* by Long & Sedley.

also within them. At one end of the spectrum were those who argued for the immortality of the soul, at the other end, those who denied any kind of postmortem existence. The former idea is associated with the Platonists, the latter with the Epicureans. However, different philosophers within the same school tradition interpreted the ideas of their predecessors differently and might have ended up with quite distinct conclusions. This is due to the fact that a philosophical "school" was not a formal institution with clearly defined doctrines but, to quote Anthony A. Long and David N. Sedley,

> . . . a group of like-minded philosophers with an agreed leader and a regular meeting place, sometimes on private premises but normally in public. School loyalty meant loyalty to the *founder* of the sect—Zeno for the Stoa, Epicurus for the Garden, Socrates and Plato for the Academy—and it is in that light that the degree of intellectual independence within each school must be viewed.[162]

Moreover, the boundaries between different schools were not always clear-cut. The philosophical tradition of a particular school was often interpreted with concepts that originated with other schools.[163] Especially Stoic terms and concepts were in common use among all philosophers without specific knowledge of their provenance.[164] Regardless of the differences between themselves and their predecessors, at least most philosophers thought they were sincerely following their school's tradition.[165]

Thus, instead of speaking of a certain school's beliefs concerning the soul's fate after death, it would be more appropriate to limit the discussion to individual philosophers and their writings. However,

---

[162] Long & Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 5 (emphasis original).

[163] This is why Hellenistic philosophy is often labeled as "eclectic." The term is problematic as it bears pejorative overtones; instead of being a creative thinker, an "eclectic" borrows freely and indiscriminately from other thinkers' doctrines. The use of the term also implies that there is something that can be defined as "orthodox." This kind of view is refuted by Donini, "The History of the Concept of Eclecticism," 28–29; cf. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, 265.

[164] Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, xiv–xv.

[165] Donini, "History," 29; cf. Dillon, "'Orthodoxy' and 'Eclecticism': Middle Paltonists and Neo-Pythagoreans," 105. A good example is Plutarch who, despite the fact that he sometimes fiercely attacks Stoicism, shows profound Stoic, and also Peripatetic, influence; Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 186. Similarly, Philo, a good Platonist, sometimes writes as a "most genuine Stoic;" Mansfeld, "Philosophy in the Service of Scripture: Philo's Exegetical Strategies," 77, 84. Such assimilation is typical of Platonism in the late Hellenistic period. It seems that Platonism was not as popular in the first century as it was earlier and later. Stoicism was far more popular and the Platonism of the time was more or less "Stoicized;" Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 12–13.

some kind of a rough overall sketch is useful for illuminating the major alternatives in the Hellenistic period.[166] Such a sketch must be limited to general guidelines as individual thinkers were not restricted to following certain established doctrines.

Of all the major philosophical schools of the Hellenistic era, the Epicureans seem to offer the clearest and most consistent thinking as far as the fate of the soul is concerned. They were known, and also severely criticized for, their denial of any posthumous existence of the soul.[167] According to Epicurus, death means the extinction of both body and soul. It is the end of all sensation and leaves nothing to fear. In his *Letter to Menoeceus* (preserved in Diogenes Laertius 10,121–35), he writes:

> Accustom yourself to the belief that death is nothing to us. For all good and evil lie in sensation, whereas death is the absence of sensation. Hence a correct understanding that death is nothing to us makes the mortality of life enjoyable, not by adding infinite time, but by ridding us of the desire for immortality. [. . .] Therefore that most frightful of evils, death, is nothing to us, seeing that when we exist death is not present, and when death is present we do not exist. Thus it is nothing to either the living or the dead, seeing that the former do not have it and the latter no longer exist (10,124–27).[168]

Our best source on Epicurean thoughts on the soul's fate after death is the Roman poet Lucretius (first century B.C.E.) and his *De rerum natura*, especially the third book. There he argues at length why the soul cannot survive death and how there is nothing frightful in death (3,417–1094). The soul is mortal like the body and nothing awaits it after death: "No one is sent down to the black pit of Tartarus. Their matter is needed so that future generations can grow" (3,966–67).[169] As the dead have no sensation, the tales of Tantalus, Tityus, and Sisyphus and the other punishments of Hades are allegories. They represent the fears and terrors of this life.

The Stoics also maintained a close interaction of soul and body.[170]

[166] Cf. Martin & Phillips, "Consolatio ad uxorem (Moralia 608A–612B)," 404–405.

[167] No writings of Epicurus survive; all we have are some fragments, the most extensive collection of which is preserved in the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius. Cf. Sextus Empiricus *Pyr.* 3,229; *Math.* 1,285. Cicero and Plutarch attack Epicurean ideas in many of their writings.

[168] Translation by Long & Sedley.

[169] Translation by Long & Sedley.

[170] According to the early Stoics, both soul and body are corporeal. Nothing can exist without a body; that is why "the soul is body" as both Cleanthes and Chrysippus claim; Long, "Soul and Body in Stoicism," 36–45.

They agreed with the idea that there is nothing to be feared in death, even though for other reasons.[171] Their teaching on the soul's survival after death was closely related to their cyclical cosmology, according to which the world repeatedly undergoes a conflagration. This ἐκπύρωσις is not destruction, but re-creation: the fire re-creates the cosmos.[172] Individual souls that are part of the divine soul, survive only until the next ἐκπύρωσις when they are reabsorbed into the divine soul and their constituent elements are ultimately redistributed in the new creation. However, it is not possible to give "the" Stoic view of the postmortem fate of the soul as the cosmological framework allowed different possibilities.[173] For example, Cleanthes seems to have been of the opinion that all the souls survive until the next ἐκπύρωσις but Chrysippus imagined it to be the fate of only the wise souls whereas the "foolish" souls last only for a short (undefined) time.[174] Some of the later Stoics held that the soul dissolves together with the body immediately after death.[175] Others maintained that virtuous men are rewarded with celestial immortality.[176] Typical of the later Stoics, such as Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, is the presentation of different views: the consciousness ceases at death, the soul survives until the ἐκπύρωσις, the soul enjoys a beatific life in a celestial abode.[177] The last-mentioned alternative does not differ from the Platonic idea of a personal afterlife.[178]

[171] Seneca attributes to Zeno the following syllogism: "No evil is glorious, death is glorious, therefore death is no evil" *Ep.* 82,9. According to many early Stoics, death was considered morally indifferent and thus not much attention was given to it; Poortman, "Death and Immortality in Greek Philosophy: From the Presocratics to the Hellenistic Era," 204.

[172] Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, 22–27.

[173] For an overall view, see Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, 114–23; Colish, *Stoic Tradition*, 29–31.

[174] Cf. Diogenes Laertius 7,157. Neither envisioned any personal survival; Poortman, "Death and Immortality," 205.

[175] Thus Epictetus *Diatr.* 2,1,17–19; 4,7,15–16.

[176] Seneca *Ep.* 79,12; 102,22–23. More references in Motto, *Seneca Sourcebook: Guide to the Thought of Lucius Annaeus Seneca*, 61–62.

[177] *Contra* Segal, *Life after Death*, 222–23. According to his view, Seneca was "simply unconcerned with death: *mors est aut finis aut transitus* "death is either the end or a transition" [hence it is of no importance to us] (*Ep.* 24,65)." This interpretation, however, fails to see that Seneca is actually referring to the Socratic way of understanding death as either an end of all sensation or a transition into a better life; see further below, p. 86.

[178] For example, in his letter addressing the question of the soul's fate (*Ep.* 102,22–30), Seneca speaks of immortality (*aeternitas*) of the good souls and calls death "the birthday of your eternity" (*aeterni natalis*).

Platonists adhered to Plato's teachings on the immortality of the soul but this basic doctrine took different shapes. In the Hellenistic period, the Platonist tradition was divided into two branches, the New Academy that pursued critical skepticism on the basis of the Socratic method of questioning, and the Old Academy that rejected the skepticism of the former and built its own thinking on Plato's doctrine of ideas.[179] Both saw themselves as true heirs of Plato. The differences among the Platonists were partly due to the fact that Plato did not leave a fixed body of doctrine but, as J. Dillon puts it, ". . . a series of guiding ideas, replete with loose ends and even contradictions, which required interpretation."[180] There was no sole center of the school to guard any "orthodoxy" of individual philosophers[181] and the tradition grew, changed and focused on different aspects. This is hardly surprising, nor unique; after all, there were centuries between Plato and the Middle Platonists of the Hellenistic and Roman eras. The Platonism of these Hellenistic thinkers was first and foremost the Platonism of their immediate teachers, who themselves had interpreted Plato according to the demands and vogues of their time.[182] Despite the differences, there were also common features. These include the idea that human beings consist of a body and a soul. At death, these two are separated and the soul, or the immortal part of it, continues living. The fate after death is different for different souls. The good souls, often those who have spent their life in the service of philosophy, enjoy happiness, usually among the heavenly bodies that are themselves living divinities.

### *The Immortal Soul in Cicero, Pseudo-Plato, and Plutarch*

It is hardly surprising, then, that the most extensive treatments concerning the afterlife in the Hellenistic philosophical texts derive from Platonic circles. All are heavily indebted to Plato's eschatological myths but often bear Stoic characteristics. I briefly discuss three such accounts, two of which derive from the productive and influential writers, Cicero and Plutarch. The third text was later circulated with the Platonic corpus and has thus been attributed to Pseudo-Plato.

[179] Long & Sedley, *Hellenistic Philosophers*, 5; Colish, *Stoic Tradition*, 70. The New Academy restricted its interest mainly to epistemology.
[180] Dillon, "Orthodoxy," 118.
[181] Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 424.
[182] Donini, "Science and Metaphysics," 130.

Despite the fact that these descriptions were written at different times, in different languages, for different functions, and were part of different contexts, they have marked affinities with each other. All three writers use traditional Platonic imagery, yet they adjust their discussion according to the demands of their own time. All three accounts describe a sharp distinction between the fates of different souls after death.

Cicero, a thinker whose philosophical position is notoriously hard to define,[183] discusses at length the fate of the soul after death in two of his writings, in the *Somnium Scipionis*, the concluding part of one of his major philosophical works *De Republica*,[184] and in the first chapter of *Tusculanae disputationes* where he records a disputation on the question of whether death is an evil. Both writings are dated close to the middle of the first century B.C.E.[185] In both of them, he promotes the Platonic doctrine of the immortal soul.[186]

[183] Illustrative of this is the fact that a lengthy discussion of Cicero is included in both the history of the Middle Platonist tradition by Gersh (*Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: The Latin Tradition*, 53–154) and in the treatment of Stoic tradition by Colish (*Stoic Tradition*, 61–158.) The latter does not claim that Cicero was himself a Stoic but describes him as "the most important single transmitter of Stoicism after the Stoics themselves" (p. 158). This is another indication of the difficulty of demarcating different philosophical schools in the Hellenistic period. In his writings, Cicero expresses many different opinions about same subjects, sometimes supporting and at other times attacking a particular philosophical school. On the grounds of such contradictions, he has often been deemed an amateur philosopher. This is clearly an underestimation considering the time he spent on philosophical questions. He himself states that he was influenced by a number of philosophical teachers such as the Epicurean Phaedrus, the Stoic Diodotus, Philo of Larissa of the New Academy, and Antiochus of Ascalon of the Old Academy. The inconsistencies are more likely due to the Hellenistic tradition which did not cause him to feel himself bound to the doctrine of any particular school but left him free to choose the most probable alternative to various questions. Cf. Glucker who compares Cicero to a "bee flitting from flower to flower and choosing according to its taste and mood at the time;" "Philosophical Affiliations," 63. Most commentators refrain from identifying Cicero with any particular school. Those who do, most often associate him with the skepticism of the New Academy.

[184] The *Somnium Scipionis* was detached early on from the rest of the work and circulated independently. The manuscript evidence attests a wide readership. The rest of *Resp.* did not fare as well and part of it is lost. See Powell, "Introduction," 119, 131–33.

[185] *Resp.* is dated between 54 and 51 B.C.E.; *Tusc.* 45–44 B.C.E. Colish, *Stoic Tradition*, 64.

[186] This is perhaps a little surprising in the light of Cicero's overall skeptical attitude. In the words of Glucker, "for the consolations of religion, with its promise of life after death, [. . .] he reserved a corner which was not to be invaded by his skepticism;" "Cicero's Philosophical Affiliations," 69.

In his dream, Scipio meets his dead adoptive grandfather Scipio Africanus, who appears to him in ". . . some high place full of stars, brilliant and clear" (*Resp.* 6,11),[187] and a little later his own father, Aemilius Paulus. He learns that those who are thought to be dead are alive and that life on earth is actually death. At death, the soul is freed from the body's prison and returns to heaven where it once came from. The proper home of the soul of a virtuous statesman is among the stars in the Milky Way. There is a special place reserved for those who have served their native land well to enjoy eternal life and happiness (6,14–16). It is not quite clear whether there are also other special places reserved for other virtuous souls. A little later (in 6,18) Africanus states that a blessed fate also awaits some others, presumably musicians and philosophers,[188] but Cicero is not explicit whether there is one abode for all the virtuous souls or different abodes for different souls.

The dream ends with the description of the fate of the souls of ". . . those who have given themselves up to the pleasures of the body, and have made themselves as it were their servants, and have been driven to violate the laws of gods and men by desires that obey only the demands of pleasure" (6,29). They wander round the earth and may return to the stars only after ". . . they have been tossed around for many generations." Obviously, then, these souls are so closely enslaved by the body that they have become body-like and are unable to ascend.[189] The very end seems to indicate some kind of purgation, perhaps also reincarnation, but the details are obscure. All in all, Cicero's own emphasis clearly lies on the reward that awaits a virtuous and prudent statesman. He has much less to say concerning the wicked. It seems that they will not suffer torments: their punishment is that they are not allowed the same destiny as the virtuous. Even more obscure is the fate of those souls that are neither especially virtuous nor wicked; Cicero says nothing concerning their postmortem fate.

---

[187] All quotations from Cicero's *Resp.* are according to Powell.

[188] Africanus says that "all this [the structure of the cosmos and its melody] wise men have imitated with strings and voices, and have opened up for themselves a way back to this place, along with all those who with great powers of intellect have pursued divine studies in human life."

[189] Cf. Plato *Phaed.* 81c; Plutarch *Fac.* 943c; *Gen. Socr.* 591c.

The content of the dream shows a distinct resemblance to Plato's myth of Er.[190] Even though Cicero does not dwell on the details of the conditions of the dead the way Plato does, the alternative fates after death show Platonic influence.[191] The idea of soul's pre-existence is also decidedly Platonic.[192] However, the distinction between the different souls—even among the good ones—may also reflect the Stoic dispute over the soul's survival after death.[193]

A similar picture emerges from the discussion in the first book of the *Tusc*. Cicero confesses, in a good Skeptic manner, that he is uncertain of the material of which souls are composed, yet he is certain that the soul is divine (1,60; cf. 1,18–22). He also leaves two alternatives for the fate after death. Citing Socrates' apology at length, he repeats his views: death is either a long sleep that takes all sensation away or it is a passage into a better life.[194] Despite this apparent agnosticism, Cicero is clearly inclined to the latter. Whatever the material of the soul, when it is freed from the body, it rises upwards and pierces the thicker atmosphere. It moves rapidly—there is nothing swifter than the soul—and stops only when it reaches lightness and heat that resemble its own. It has arrived in its natural home among the stars. The return to the stars is easy for the good souls but the wicked souls must follow a road that is remote from the company of the gods (1,43–44, 72–73). Thus the good and the wicked share a different fate after death, even though Cicero does not describe any punishment for the wicked.[195]

[190] As the name indicates, Cicero meant *De Republica* as a counterpart to Plato's dialogue of the same name. Like Plato, he also ends his *Republic* with an eschatological myth which is introduced in the narrative as a part of a discussion of the rewards of virtue. There are also differences. First, Cicero's account is more realistic. He retells a *dream* of a living person, not a myth of a hero who is fabulously recovered twelve days after his death. Moreover, his cosmological vision corresponds to the current scientific knowledge and is far from Plato's poetic fantasy; Powell, "Introduction," 121–23.

[191] Cicero differs from Plato in his underlining the virtue of a *statesman*, instead of a philosopher who, according to Plato, is the most virtuous kind of human being. However, he might have found his inspiration in Socrates' words "the happiest of those, and those who go to the best place, are those who have practiced the social and civil virtues" *Phaed.* 82a–b.

[192] Cf. *Tim.* 41d–e. In *Phaedo* 84e Plato speaks of the "return of the souls to the stars." Cicero alludes to this passage in *Tusc.* 1,72.

[193] Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 100.

[194] *Apol.* 40c, cited in *Tusc.* 1,97–99.

[195] According to Cicero, stories concerning otherworldly torments are mere fables and it is foolish to believe in them; *Tusc.* 1,5–6. On the other hand, in some of

Socrates' apology is also a starting point for the Pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus*. Practically nothing is known about the authorship of the text, and dating it is also difficult.[196] It is a peculiar example of an ancient consolation[197] that reports an incident of Socrates consoling a dying friend. Socrates ends his consolation by describing what happens to the souls after death. They are ferried across Acheron and Cocytos to the Plain of Truth where Minos and Rhadamanthys interrogate them. The good are sent to live in a place of the pious

> . . . where the ungrudging seasons teem with fruits of every kind, where fountains of pure water flow, and where all kinds of meadows bloom with flowers of many colors. Here are the discourses of the philosophers, and performances of poets, cyclic dances, and concerts, well arranged drinking-parties, and self-furnished feasts, undiluted freedom from pain and a life of pleasure. No fierce cold or heat is found there, but a mild climate tempered by the sun's gentle rays is spread about. There is a certain place of honor for those who are initiated, and there they celebrate their holy rites (*Ax.* 371d).[198]

But others, those who have led a life of crime

> . . . are led by the Furies to Erebus and Chaos through Tartarus, where there is a region of the impious, the ceaseless fetching of water by the Danaids, the thirst of Tantalus, the entrails of Tityus eternally devoured and regenerated, the never-resting stone of Sisyphus, whose end of toil is again the beginning. There are those who are being licked clean by wild beasts, set persistently on fire by torches of the Avengers, and who, tortured with every kind of torture, are consumed by everlasting punishments (*Ax.* 371e–372a).

The description owes much to Plato: the juxtaposition of body and soul, the wandering of the soul after death, its judgment by Minos and Rhadamanthys, and the different fates of the virtuous and the wicked are part of the Platonic tradition of the author. He uses many other traditional images as well. The temperate climate and the painless life are features already known in the Homeric and Hesiodic accounts of Elysium.[199] The fountains of pure water resemble the

---

his orations aimed at a wider audience he seems to use postmortem punishments as a deterrent; *Phil.* 14,12,32; see Bernstein, *Formation*, 120–21.

[196] See Souilhé, "Notice," 123–36. He dates the text to the first century B.C.E. Cf. Hershbell, "Introduction," 10–21.

[197] For more on the literary genre of consolations, see below pp. 114–16.

[198] All quotations from Pseudo-Plato are according to Hershbell.

[199] *Od.* 4,566–68; Hesiod *Op.* 170–72. Cf. Pindar *Ol.* 2,70–74.

cool water from the lake of memory in the Bacchic gold leaves.[200] Poetic performances, drinking parties, and other joys belong to the underworld descriptions of Pindar, Plutarch and Lucian.[201] The idea of a place of honor (προεδρία) for the initiates has a counterpart in Plutarch, according to whom "ancient poets and philosophers" promise a place of honor (προεδρία) for the blessed departed (*Cons. Apoll.* 120b).[202]

A third example of the Hellenistic descriptions of the afterlife comes from the writings of Plutarch, composed at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century C.E.[203] Plutarch was a Platonist[204] and included eschatological myths in the spirit of Plato in several of his works.[205] The fate of the soul after death is treated in three pieces, *De sera numinis vindicta*, *De genio Socratis*, and *De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet*.[206] As in the case of Plato, Plutarch's accounts do not form a coherent picture. This is natural since each myth is part of a larger context with a different theme and each of them develops that theme with varying details.[207] The differences also point to the fact that Plutarch did not mean them to be taken literally. For example, after relating the myth of the souls in *De facie*, Sulla invites his listeners to "make what they will" of it, i.e., to interpret its message in the most suitable way.[208] This does not mean, how-

[200] See the text above on p. 71.
[201] Pindar frg. 129; Plutarch *Sera* 565f.; Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 2,14–16.
[202] According to Diogenes Laertius (6,39), the Athenians held that the initiates have places of honor (προεδρίας) after death. See Hershbell, "Introduction," 68, n. 75.
[203] Plutarch was born around the middle of the first century C.E. and thus lived all his life in the Imperial period. Calling him a Hellenistic writer does not refer to the Hellenistic period (which strictly speaking is usually thought to come in an end with the Roman conquest of Egypt in 30 B.C.E.) but to his philosophical heritage. Moreover, the most thorough synthesis of Roman and Greek traditions, often labeled as "Hellenistic," took place only in the Imperial era. Cf. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World A.D. 50–250*, 135–86.
[204] According to a recent definition, "Plutarch was a Platonist, which is to say that he espoused a positive, if undogmatic, philosophical system based on an interpretation of Plato's writings." (Boys-Stones, "Thyrsus-Bearer of the Academy or Enthusiast for Plato," 41.) In the same article, Boys-Stones argues that Plutarch was also committed to the Skeptic tradition of the New Academy which he understood to be in full accordance with his Platonism (pp. 42, 55).
[205] Cf. Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's* Moralia *and* Lives, 26; Donini, "Science and Metaphysics," 128.
[206] See Culianu, *Psychanodia*, 43–47; *Expériences*, 103–17.
[207] Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 135.
[208] Donini, "Science and Metaphysics," 138–39.

ever, that Plutarch did not take them *seriously*; in his view, myth complements science and vice versa. That is why he includes metaphysical speculations on the myths in scientific treatises and integrates scientific knowledge in the myths.[209]

Despite the differences, all Plutarch's myths share the basic belief in the soul's immortality and differentiated fates common to all Platonist speculations concerning the afterlife. Characteristic of Plutarch's thought is the separation of ψυχή and νοῦς, a counterpart to Plato's distinction between the mortal and the immortal part of the soul.[210] In *De facie*, Plutarch seems to distinguish three kinds of people. The most virtuous ones are obedient to their νοῦς, others try to struggle against it but are finally subdued. A third class of people are those who have no higher νοῦς element (592a–b).[211] In Plutarch's eschatological frame, ψυχή is affiliated with the moon and νοῦς with the sun (943a).[212]

At the end of *De sera* (563b–568a), Plutarch tells a myth of a certain Thespesius' journey in the afterlife.[213] The myth is a part of a discussion on the delayed punishment of the wicked and especially whether it is justified that descendants are punished for the crimes committed by their ancestors. The answer provided by the myth is that punishments after death accord with the severity of the deeds and their potential earthly consequences. Thus, the immortality of

---

[209] Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 144; Donini, "Science and Metaphysics," 138–39.

[210] Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 211; Donini, "Science and Metaphysics," 142–43. The relation of the two remains somewhat obscure. In *Fac.*, νοῦς seems to be both outside of the soul, a presiding δαίμων over it, and an internal part of the soul. For more on Plutarch's daimonology, see Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 216–24; Russell, *Plutarch*, 75–79; Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 85–183.

[211] Plutarch was probably inspired by the myth of the different charioteers of the soul in Plato's *Phaedrus*, 248a; Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 213–14. A similar distinction into three classes of people is evident in *Gen.Socr.*; see Babut, "Le dialogue de Plutarque 'Sur le démon de Socrate.' Essai d'interprétation," 69. Compare also the distinction of souls in *Sera* 564a–c.

[212] See Russell, *Plutarch*, 73–74.

[213] The mythical character of the account is emphasized by two factors. First, it is based on hearsay: Plutarch does not recount his own experience nor does he know the person to whom the incident happened but he heard it from a certain Protogenes who was a friend of Thespesius. Second, the very name of Thespesius reveals that the man is a literary figure. Originally, the man was called Aridaeus but receives the name Thespesius in the otherworld. The adjective θεσπέσιος, derived from θεός and ἔσπον (= εἶπον), refers to things that can be spoken by none but god, i.e., the unspeakable, and it is used of divine, wondrous and marvelous things. Liddell & Scott, s.v.

the soul is an answer to theodicy: punishments in the afterlife acquit the gods of any injustice in delaying the punishments of the wicked on earth (560a–b). The myth is a thorough imitation of Plato's account of Er.[214] Like Er, Plutarch's hero is struck by a blow, is taken for dead but recovers at his funeral.[215] The heavenly journey also has close Platonic affinities. The souls of the dead rise through heaven like spindles (564a; cf. *Resp.* 10,616c–617d).[216] The soul of a dead kinsman acts as a guide (564c; cf. the daimon guide in *Phaed.* 107d). The wicked souls bear scars of their vices on them (564d–e; cf. *Gorg.* 524b–525b). Adrasteia and her three helpers, Dike, Poine, and Erinys, determine the fate of the souls (564e–565a; cf. *Resp.* 10,617c–d) who are sent to be reborn (567f; cf. *Resp.* 10,620a–d). Finally, a great rush of wind takes the visitor back to his body and he opens his eyes in his grave (568a; cf. *Resp.* 10,621b).

In his description of the conditions of the otherworld, however, Plutarch goes beyond Plato. First, he introduces Dionysiac elements into the narrative.[217] The guide takes Thespesius to a great chasm called "the place of Lethe" which is a Bacchic grotto and represents the pleasures of the body. It is the route Dionysus took when he brought his mortal mother Semele to make her immortal.[218] Second, whereas Plato only referred to horrible punishments, Plutarch dwells on their details. The punishments vary according to the severity of the deeds done and the potential punishment received on earth. The most horrible punishments are for those whose punishment on earth had passed over to their descendants.[219] The punishments are meant to purge the wicked souls, only the incurable are imprisoned in the "Nameless and Unseen" (εἰς τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ ἀόρατον); i.e., they are

[214] Cf. Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 134–38. Brenk deems it "Plutarch's most unoriginal eschatological myth." (p. 26.)

[215] The name Aridaeus probably has a Platonic origin. In *Resp.* 10,615e, one of the souls undergoing punishment is called Ardiaeus. In later quotations of the passage, the name often appears in the form Aridaeus; Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 137 n. 29; Culianu, *Psychanodia*, 45.

[216] Plutarch seems to fix the realm of Hades in the air between the moon and the earth; cf. *Gen. Socr.* 591a–b. This may go back to Plato; cf. *Leg.* 10,904d.

[217] Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 138; Culianu, *Psychanodia*, 114–15. Cf. Ps.-Pl. *Ax.* 371c–e.

[218] Cf. Diodorus Siculus 4,25,4; Pausanias 2,31,2; 37,5.

[219] The younger generations who have suffered on earth from the unpunished crimes of their parents attack the older generations and force them back into the torments.

no longer seen and heard but sink into oblivion. The vivid description is worth quoting at length:

> He observed that while the torment of those who had been recognized in their wickedness and punished on the spot was not so harsh or prolonged in the otherworld, as it now dealt only with the irrational and passionate part of the soul, those who on the contrary had cloaked themselves in the pretence and repute of virtue and passed their lives in undetected vice were surrounded by a different set of officers who compelled them laboriously and painfully to turn the inward parts of their soul outward, writhing unnaturally and curving back upon themselves, as the sea-scolopendras turn themselves inside out when they have swallowed the hook; and some of them were skinned and laid open and shown to be ulcered and blotched, their wickedness being in their rational and sovereign part. He told of seeing other souls coiled like vipers around each other in twos and threes and yet greater number, devouring one another in rancour and bitterness for what they had endured or done in life; moreover (he said) there were lakes lying side by side, one a seething lake of gold, a second, piercing cold, of lead, and a third of rugged iron, with certain daemons in charge, who, like smiths, were using tongs to raise and lower alternately the souls of those whose wickedness was due to insatiable and overreaching avarice. Thus, when the souls had grown red hot in the gold from the blazing heat, the daemons plunged them into the lake of lead; when they had there been chilled and hardened, like hailstones, they were removed to the lake of iron. Here they turned an intense black and were altered in appearance, as their hardness caused them to become chipped and crushed; and after this they were once more taken to the gold, enduring, as he said, the most fearful agonies in the cause of each change (*Sera* 567b–d).[220]

These myths do not give the complete picture of Plutarch's eschatological thinking. In *De superstitione*, he seems to contradict himself by ridiculing the very things he describes in his myths. He scorns

[220] Translation by de Lacy and Einarson. Plutarch develops the eschatological geography further in the myths in *Gen. Socr.* 590c–594a and *Fac.* 940f–945d. There, the essential role of the moon is emphasized. In *Gen. Socr*, the road to Hades runs along the side of the moon, and the moon apparently passes over the Styx from which the better souls are rescued as they manage to cling to it, while the unclean slip off. According to the description in *Fac.*, the good souls are conveyed to the moon after the first death, which separates the soul from the body. There they continue to lead an easy life (ῥᾷστον βίον) but a blessed life only occurs after a second death which separates the soul and the mind (νοῦς). While the souls wander in the region between the earth and the moon, the unjust souls pay penalties, but good souls pass a certain time of purification in the gentlest place of the air which is called "the meads of Hades" (λειμῶνας Ἅιδου).

those who think that eternal punishments in Hades await them after death with fiery rivers, horrible creatures, judges, punishers, and chasms full of horrifying things, and calls their view "a miserable superstition" (*Superst.* 167a). The inconsistencies between *De superstitione* and the rest of the Plutarchan corpus has led many to consider it either inauthentic[221] or a work of his youth that reflects his youthful skepticism from which he turned back to more traditional beliefs only later in life.[222]

A closer look, however, reveals that the differences between *De superstitione* and the other writings are not as great as often maintained.[223] For the ancient writers, "superstition" did not mean "childish belief in supernatural beings and phenomena" or the like but excessive fear of gods and other divine beings whose existence was not denied as such.[224] Thus, in *De superstitione*, Plutarch does not necessarily deny any postmortem punishments but rebukes the immoderate fear of these punishments and their eternity.[225] In Plutarch's view, gods are not malevolent but use punishments in order to execute justice, as argued in *De sera*.[226] If the evil-doers are not punished on earth, they will be penalized after death. Yet the purpose of the punishments is not only retributive but also curative. They are a kind of divine therapy to correct the souls and to prevent them from doing evil.[227] This would cohere with some other writings where Plutarch speaks of oblivion as the eternal fate of the wicked.[228]

---

[221] For full discussion, see M. Smith, "De Superstitione (Moralia 164E–171F)," 1–7.

[222] This kind of view is refuted by Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 65–84.

[223] The relationship between *Superst.* and other Plutarchan writings is treated in detail by Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 9–27. See also Russell, *Plutarch*, 80–81.

[224] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 114. This is the negative meaning of the word. Besides, the term δεισιδαιμονία might be used as a positive or neutral term referring to the (appropriate) respect for the gods. See Martin, *Inventing*, 18–19.

[225] "Superstition" for Plutarch reflects ignorance about the true nature of the gods. In this respect, it resembles atheism. According to Plutarch, superstition is the worse of the two because it not only involves a wrong opinion but also fear which makes superstition dangerous. The fear of the gods is especially dangerous because there is no way and no place one can hide from the gods; Martin, *Inventing*, 95.

[226] *Contra* Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 26. According to him, the first section of the dialogue suggests that all evil is punished in this life and thus the myth is not essential to the argument but is added only for literary reasons.

[227] Betz & Dirkse & Smith, "De sera numinis vindicta (Moralia 548A–568A)," 182.

[228] *De lat viv.* 1130c–e. This is quite compatible with the description in *De sera* where the incurable souls are led to the "Nameless and Unseen" (see above p. 94); Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 21–27. Brenk's discussion, however, contains an odd reading

Despite the multiplicity of different views and contrasting ideas even within a single corpus of writings, the Greco-Roman sources from the Hellenistic and Roman periods attest a strong strand of belief in differentiated fates for different souls after death. Often the division is made on moral grounds; the good are rewarded and the wicked are punished. In this respect, the fate of the rich man and Lazarus in Luke's story fits well in its broader Hellenistic context. However, the use of literary sources poses a question: how representative is the view they offer? Do they reflect the view of only a minority and have little to do with the beliefs of the greater population? Before proceeding to the Jewish sources, we must consider what we can deduce about the popularity of the belief in differentiated fates.

concerning a passage in *De virt. mor.* (450a). According to him, Plutarch calls belief in hell "insane" in this passage. This, in my opinion, is an exaggeration. Plutarch seems to merely state that there are different views concerning death. Some think that death is an evil as it deprives them of the goods of life; for others it is an evil because of the eternal torments beneath the earth.

CHAPTER SIX

# DIFFERENTIATED FATES: ONLY AN ELITE VIEW?

In the ancient world, belief in postmortem existence was usually considered a given fact.[1] Both the archeological evidence and the existent literary sources indicate that belief in a continued existence after death was prevalent throughout the ancient Mediterranean and the Near East: in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, Greece, Syria and Palestine, including ancient Israel.[2] Some kind of belief in some kind of afterlife must have been widespread judging from the fact that the deceased were regularly fed by means of offerings.[3] These offerings would, of course, be pointless if the dead did not exist somewhere. Necromantic practices, such as consulting the dead through an oracle,[4] different public and private rituals for the dead, and legislation controlling them,[5] also point in the same direction.

At the same time, many scholars maintain that belief in a future life was "reduced to the minimum,"[6] it was "not widespread, nor clear, nor very strong."[7] According to this view, contemplation of the afterlife did not belong to Greek and Roman paganism which ". . . was basically directed to this life, not that of the hereafter."[8] These scholars make a sharp distinction between immortality, which includes some kind of renewal of life after death, and passive, shadowy, witless existence, the way life after death is described in the

---

[1] "In the ancient world, belief in life after death was widespread, considered normal, and not generally weakened by skepticism." McDannell & Lang, *Heaven: A History*, 1.

[2] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 234, 251.

[3] Garland, *Greek Way*, 110; Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 29–41. Offerings for the dead and different provisions for the afterlife are naturally a universal phenomenon, known in numerous cultures and from the earliest times of humankind; see, e.g., Segal, *Life after Death*, 15–16.

[4] Cumont, *Lux Perpetua*, 90–108; Bourguignon, "Necromancy," 75–76; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 71–83.

[5] See the thorough discussion in Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 36–81.

[6] Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 131.

[7] Lattimore, *Themes*, 342.

[8] Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 95; MacMullen, *Paganism*, 51–57; Garland, *Greek Way*, 48; J. Davies, *Death*, 62.

Homeric epics. According to their view, most people expected postmortem life to be of the Homeric type, and belief in immortality was rare all through antiquity, including the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The term "immortality," however, is ambiguous both in ancient texts and in modern scholarly works.[9] In its literal meaning, it denotes life *without* death, that is, everlasting life. Gods are immortal; they never die. Heroes can also be immortal, sometimes also ordinary humans, who have attained a divine status and been elevated to the level of gods.[10] On the other hand, "immortality" may mean eternal life *despite* death, that is, life that continues eternally after death. However, some scholars seem to use the word to denote any kind of postmortem existence, including the Homeric type.[11] To distinguish "real" immortality from the passive existence, some scholars refer to the "real" immortality as a "positive"[12] or "meaningful"[13] or "beatific"[14] or "real, upward"[15] afterlife. The problem of such definitions is that they exclude the "negative" afterlife, that is, postmortem punishments. That is why, in this study, I prefer to speak of "personal" afterlife.

Regardless of the several descriptions of life after death in literature, scholars tend to minimize their value as useful witnesses to general beliefs. Philosophers and other ancient authors represent only the literate elite and the ideas reflected in their writings should not be generalized.[16] Many scholars claim that, in the overall history of Greek eschatology, the belief in a differentiated fate after death was a minor trend.[17] The philosophical speculations concerning life after

---

[9] Cf. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 85.

[10] Ries, "Immortality," 246.

[11] Thus, for example, Lattimore: "Homer's description of the *psyche* itself involves the condition of its immortality. It can appear, talk, and be talked to, but it has no power, sense, or life worth speaking of." *Themes*, 44.

[12] E.g., Goldingay, "Death and Afterlife in the Psalms," 61. He also speaks of a "worthwhile" afterlife.

[13] E.g., Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110. Cf. Day who speaks of "a more worthwhile afterlife;" "The Development of Belief in Life after Death in Ancient Israel," 231 and *passim*.

[14] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife, passim*.

[15] Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions*, 15, 122.

[16] MacMullen, *Paganism*, 9; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 6–7.

[17] Garland, *Greek Way*, 66. According to him, "While belief in Hades as a place of punishment for certain crimes persisted from the time of Homer to the Classical period and beyond, criminally speaking the Greek underworld never became fully democratised: crimes of average venality excited neither dispraise nor retribution."

death remained the belief of only a small circle and differed from the popular opinion.[18] While it is true that the vast majority were illiterate and had no direct access to the writings, in an oral/aural culture, writings were normally read aloud and might also have reached those not able to read themselves.[19] This means that the dichotomy between philosophical and popular views was not necessarily as sharp as often maintained.

The beliefs of the wider population have been sought from epitaphs, which are seen to reflect the views of a whole variety of people, both rich and poor, members of the elite and common folk.[20] Studies on the sepulchral material have revealed that the number of those epitaphs that show either explicit belief in or denial of an afterlife is very small among the hundreds of thousands of epitaphs known from Greek and Roman antiquity.[21] This has strengthened the scholarly view that the ordinary people, that is, the vast majority, were not keenly interested in life after death. If they imagined any kind of afterlife, it was ". . . as a shadowy ghost, as a citizen of Hades' world or of Elysium, as nothing at all."[22] The only exception, which existed only to a limited degree, was offered by the mysteries which presumed a belief in personal afterlives (rewards and punishments).[23] This view, however, is rather daring and based on ambiguous evidence, as becomes evident when a closer look is taken at both the epigraphic record and the literary evidence.

[18] Crehan, "Near Eastern Societies," 100; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 7–8.
[19] Cf., e.g., Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum," 15–17.
[20] Cf. Saller & Shaw, "Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers and Slaves," 127–28.
[21] Lattimore, *Themes*, 342. Lattimore estimated the number of published epitaphs in Latin to be "considerably more than a hundred thousand" and in Greek to be "tens of thousands;" *Themes*, 14. In the past decades, the number of known inscriptions has been constantly growing. According to the estimation of Saller and Shaw, the number of funerary inscriptions solely in Latin must be between 170–190,000; "Tombstones," 124, n. 1. Peres estimates the number of Greek inscriptions to be 100,000, half of them non-Christian and the other half Christian; *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 5.
[22] Lattimore, *Themes*, 74. Similarly, although with hesitation, Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 109.
[23] Garland, *Greek Way*, 48.

## 6.1. The Ambiguity of the Epigraphic Sources

A standard work on Greek and Latin funerary inscriptions is Richmond Lattimore's *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Even though it was first published more than six decades ago, in 1942, it still offers the fullest discussion on ancient Greek and Latin funerary inscriptions and is continually referred to in more recent scholarly works. Not even the most recent study on funerary inscriptions, the analysis of Imre Peres published in 2003, differs significantly from Lattimore's work and his way of categorizing different epitaphs.[24] Lattimore takes a critical stance against earlier scholars who assumed that ". . . every statement which *might* be interpreted as implying a belief in immortality *does* imply such a belief."[25] Lattimore's criticism of the overenthusiasm of some of his predecessors is certainly to the point,[26] yet his own minimalist approach suffers from the very same methodological shortcomings even though the results are completely the reverse.

Neither approach takes sufficiently into account the ambiguous nature of most funerary inscriptions. Very few, if any of the inscriptions, would permit only one kind of reading. The result, then, seems to depend on the overall outlook of the scholar. Moreover, as Lattimore himself remarks, most of these inscriptions are in verse, they are formalistic and conventional, probably based on widely circulated, standardized models, such as many of the memorial verses used in death notices in present-day newspapers.[27] Thus their use as evidence for exact beliefs is highly debatable.

It is evident that most epitaphs do not tell anything about ideas of the afterlife. In the vast majority of the funerary inscriptions, there is no reference to life after death whatsoever. The epitaphs concentrate on worldly aspects; the fame of the deceased, or the events of their lives, or their customary deeds, or the circumstances of their deaths, or lamentations for them.[28] Many contain greetings or exhor-

---

[24] See Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 20–105.

[25] Lattimore, *Themes*, 48, n. 199 (emphasis original).

[26] A similar shift from an overenthusiastic to a minimalist view has taken place in the scholarship concerning Jewish funerary inscriptions, see Rutgers, "Death and Afterlife: The Inscriptional Evidence," 293–99.

[27] J. Davies, *Death*, 172.

[28] A typical feature of Roman epitaphs is also the name of the commemorator. This derived from the obligations of the heir, often imposed by the will. Thus, one

tations to the passersby.[29] This, however, does not necessarily mean that the vast majority of people were indifferent towards life after death. It only means that a funerary inscription was not regarded the proper place to express such beliefs.[30] The most important function of the gravestones was to keep the memory of the deceased alive.[31] In the simplest form, this function was fulfilled solely by engraving the name of the deceased in stone.

Those epitaphs that contain some information concerning post-mortem expectations are open to different interpretations. Some of them refer to Hades or Persephone (or some other chthonic deity), but the brevity of the inscriptions hardly enables one to discern what kind of afterlife is imagined. The references might imply a traditional belief in an undifferentiated existence in the realm of the dead but the possibility of a more personal fate after death cannot always be ruled out.[32] The inscriptions in both the *Greek Anthology* and those found on actual sites originate from different places and ages, which makes it possible that, even though same expressions are used, they refer to different ideas.[33]

Lattimore distinguishes three kinds of epitaphs that deal with life after death: a) those that express or imply belief in immortality, b)

of the functions of the tombstone was to indicate that the heir had discharged this duty; Meyer, "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs," 75–78, 95.

[29] The same phenomenon is seen in Jewish epitaphs, which usually contain such information as the name of the deceased and some commemorative elements describing the role of the deceased in his or her community or family; see Rutgers, "Death and Afterlife," 299–301. He also refers to a study that estimates that 80% of all pagan epitaphs refer exclusively to the earthly life of the deceased.

[30] Cf. Rutgers, "Death and Afterlife," 300–304. He suggests that the Jewish inscriptions were used for some commemorative practices held at the tomb. That is why it was more important to fill the limited space with information on the deceased's earthly life than to express belief in an afterlife. It also explains the use of such expressions as "shalom," "amen" and "sela" which carry liturgical overtones.

[31] Van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millenium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 B.C.E.–700 C.E.)*, 40.

[32] Some examples of inscriptions of this type include *Anth. Pal.* 7,58, 59, 319, 364, 365, 387, 391, 452, 476, 477, 545, 671; Lattimore, *Themes*, 58–59, 63.

[33] It must be borne in mind that the distribution of funerary inscriptions both geographically and temporally is sporadic and often a matter of chance; cf. van der Horst, *Ancient*, 21. The dating of the inscriptions poses problems of its own. They rarely provide any internal criteria for dating and the external criterion of the shape of letters and the style of writing is not always very helpful. See Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions*, 62–66.

those that question it, and c) those that deny it. A closer look reveals that it is extremely hard to place individual inscriptions into these categories. Even those epitaphs that explicitly refer to immortality (usually by using the word ἀθάνατος) are ambiguous. Some of them clearly refer to the expectation that the soul of the deceased will reside with the immortal gods and great figures of the past,[34] yet in others immortality may have been understood metaphorically, as immortal fame, for example. Sometimes the very monument erected on the tomb is thought to bring immortality: as long as the monument exists, the deceased is remembered and is thus immortal. Such epitaphs then, albeit referring to immortality, do not indicate a blessed afterlife with other immortals. The contrary is more likely: the monument is needed to guarantee immortal fame among the living as no other kind of immortality is expected. An example found in the *Greek Anthology* runs thus:

> Here the earth covers Pythonax and his brother, before they saw the prime of their lovely youth. Their father, Megaristus, set up this monument to them dead, an immortal gift to his mortal sons (*Anth. Pal.* 7,300).[35]

The next category, inscriptions that seem to question belief in life after death, is even more difficult in this respect.[36] Under this category, Lattimore lists inscriptions that contain the phrase "even though dead" or the like (καὶ θνήσκων κτλ.), such as: "Though dead I have a mind and no slight one either." Or: "Though I am dead I love my husband." According to Lattimore, these expressions reflect the presumption that ". . . it is surprising to suppose that anything can affect the dead. The statement is made as if in the face of powerful evidence to the contrary."[37] This, however, is a rather narrow reading. It may just as well be that the phrase implies nothing of the sort.

Another set of inscriptions that, according to Lattimore, question immortality include such abbreviations as *s.t.t.l.* (*sit tibi terra levis*, may the earth lie lightly on you) and *n.f.n.s.n.c.* (*non fui, non sum, non curo*;

[34] *Anth. Pal.* 7,61, 92, 362, 363; cf. Lattimore, *Themes*, 49–55.
[35] Other examples include *Anth. Pal.* 7,327, 362, 451, 590; Lattimore, *Themes*, 49–50.
[36] The life of the dead is sometimes questioned, hardly ever plainly denied. See examples in Lattimore, *Themes*, 56–65.
[37] Lattimore, *Themes*, 57–58.

I was not, I am not, I care not).[38] The frequency of the phrases is attested by the fact that they are usually abbreviated.[39] But what do these formulae actually mean? At least partly, their usage may have been conventional with the original meaning lost.[40] Moreover, the wish *sit tibi terra levis* does not necessarily imply that the person remains in the grave and has no life after death. Both the belief that the dead were in their tomb and that they resided in Hades existed side by side and did not exclude each other.[41] In some Greek funerary inscriptions, both the wish that the earth be light over the deceased and a reference to a journey to Hades occur side by side.[42]

Lattimore also includes in the same category those inscriptions where the living are exhorted to enjoy their life while still alive. These are interpreted as reflecting Epicurean nihilism: the best that people can do is enjoy life since there is nothing after death.[43] But this is not the only possible interpretation. Most of these inscriptions say nothing concerning life after death as such. Interestingly, scholars, who maintain that ordinary people did not share the philosophical speculations concerning life after death,[44] simultaneously assume that Epicurean philosophy had penetrated all levels of society and was reflected in the funerary inscriptions.

The inscriptions of the third category, those that seem to deny any form of life after death, are also open to several interpretations.

---

[38] Lattimore, *Themes*, 65–74, 82–85.

[39] Both expressions seem to derive from Greek even though there is no one fixed Greek formula that was used; see van der Horst, *Ancient*, 54. Even though the Latin expressions are frequent, their geographical distribution is not very wide.

[40] An analogous case is the dedication to gods or spirits of death, the *Dis Manibus*, often abbreviated *DM*, that occurs in many Jewish and Christian epitaphs. It seems that, at least partly, the use of the formula is simply imitation of pagan precursors without any consciousness of the original meaning; van der Horst, *Ancient*, 42–43; Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife*, 16–21; cf. Kant, "Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin," 704.

[41] Garland, *Greek Way*, 119; cf. Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 24–26.

[42] *Anth. Pal.* 7,476; cf. also 7,477.

[43] Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 128–32.

[44] For example, Cumont (*Lux perpetua*, 206) points out that there are no traces of the belief in metempsychosis in the epitaphs. From this fact Crehan concludes ("Near Eastern Societies," 100):

> If it had been firmly held as a belief, one would have expected to find that here and there a prayer for a better deal next time round, or for a safe return to old haunts, would appear on the tombs. Orphism and Pythagorean speculations must have rested at the level of intellectual discussion, with no roots in the life of the people.

An example is a tombstone of a certain Charidas which contains the following dialogue:

> —Does Charidas rest beneath you?—If you speak of the son of Arimmas of Cyrene, he is beneath me.—Charidas, what is it like below?—Very dark.—What about the way up?—A lie.—And Pluto?—A myth.—We are done for! (*Anth. Pal.* 7,524.)

This is where many scholars end the quotation.[45] The inscription, however, does not end there. Its final verse, difficult to make sense of, seems to indicate that the dead do exist in Hades despite the nihilism of Charidas. The line most probably means that it is possible to obtain in Hades "a great ox for a coin of Pella" and according to a plausible interpretation it is a proverbial statement on the cheapness of things in Hades.[46] Whatever its exact meaning the verse itself contradicts the idea that there is nothing to be expected after death.

Another inscription that denies any postmortem existence was found in Rome:

> Wayfarer, do not pass by my epitaph, but stand and listen, and then, when you have learned the truth, proceed. There is no boat in Hades, no ferryman Charon, no Aeacus keeper of the keys, nor any dog called Cerberus. All of us who have died and gone below are bones and ashes: there is nothing else. What I have told you is true. Now withdraw, wayfarer, so that you will not think that, even though dead, I talk too much.[47]

This inscription is relatively late; Lattimore dates it to the third or fourth century C.E. It is noteworthy, then, that such mythological eschatology was common enough to be worth refuting even at so late a date. Most other epitaphs that refute immortality are also late and seem to contain anti-Christian polemic.[48] The polemical char-

[45] See, e.g., Garland, *Greek Way*, 75.

[46] The difficult final verse runs as follows: εἰ δὲ τὸν ἡδὺν βούλει, πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας εἰν ἀίδῃ. W.R. Paton translates it: "If you want to hear something agreeable, a large ox in Hades costs a shilling." Bremer phrases it: "But if you prefer the delightful version: Here one gets a sirloin steak for a shilling." ("Death and Immortality," 113.) According to Gow and Page, the explanation that the verse refers to the cheapness of things in Hades has been generally accepted and "one may hope that it is true;" *The Greek Anthology Hellenistic Epigrams 2*, 189.

[47] Lattimore, *Themes*, 75; cf. Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 30–31. For other examples, see Lattimore pp. 74–82. Some of his interpretations may be questioned, especially those of inscriptions that refer to death as everlasting fate, pp. 77–78.

[48] Lattimore, *Themes*, 74–75; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 29–30, 163–64, 171–72.

acter of such inscriptions implies not only that there were people who did not believe in life after death but also that there were others who did hold such a belief.

To summarize the epigraphic evidence: The funerary inscriptions are not particularly helpful for sketching an overall view of the prevalence and form of beliefs in the afterlife. The vast majority are silent about the matter but it is too hasty to conclude that most people were indifferent towards postmortem fate on that basis. Those inscriptions that make reference to conditions after death frequently make use of the traditional Homeric descriptions of Hades. This, again, does not necessarily imply a Homeric view. The Homeric terms were used for denoting new ideas in later times, as many literary descriptions attest. Moreover, these new ideas—such as punishments and rewards after death—were ascribed to Homer.[49] The inscriptions tend to repeat traditional metaphors and themes long after there were other ways of thinking of the afterlife.[50] This is also seen in Christian epitaphs where

> . . . side by side with the new phraseology inspired by faith and uniquely Christian, we find many of the old pagan expressions; sometimes [. . .] even expressions which, taken seriously, are in direct opposition to the tenets of Christianity.[51]

It is often noted that funerary customs tend to be conservative[52] and the very same can be said concerning funerary inscriptions. Thus, there is no straight relationship between eschatological beliefs and funerary inscriptions.[53]

What I have argued so far naturally does not mean the opposite, namely that belief in a personal afterlife was prevalent among people in general. All I am claiming is that the epigraphic sources cannot be used to promote the idea that people were either unconcerned about life after death or mainly held the traditional Homeric view of a shadowy and powerless existence of the dead. The epigraphic

---

[49] See further below, pp. 107–108.

[50] Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 93, 123.

[51] Lattimore, *Themes*, 301. Cf. J. Davies, *Death*, 17, and the many articles of G. Sanders, conveniently collected in *Lapides memores: Païens et chrétiens face à la mort: le témoignage de l'épigraphie funéraire latine*, e.g., 38–47, 74–78, 139–40, 168–69.

[52] Kurtz & Broadman, *Greek Burial Customs*, 142; Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 237; J. Davies, *Death*, 7–8.

[53] Cf. Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200 C.E.–1336 C.E.*, 51.

record is also non-representative in another respect. Hardly ever do the inscriptions refer to punishments or other evil fates after death.[54] This is obviously due to the fact that usually the tombstones were erected for relatives or others who were imagined as receiving a good lot, if anything, after death. Yet many literary sources testify that common people feared postmortem punishments and imagined many kinds of different torments that awaited souls in the otherworld. Thus, in order to place the epigraphic evidence in perspective, we must consider the literary sources.

## 6.2. Popular Views Reflected in Literary Sources

Despite the fact that literacy was limited and thus the literary sources only reflect the views of a tiny minority, their value should not be underestimated. Even though philosophical and other literary speculations do not represent the ideas of the wider population as such, a critical reading can increase our understanding of the more popular views.[55] There are two crucial questions concerning the literary sources. First, is there any resemblance, at least as far as we can tell, between the literate and non-literate views? In other words, are there any markers that might suggest that the views reflected in literature actually represent wider beliefs? Second, do the sources themselves say anything explicit concerning the beliefs of the wider population? It is important to emphasize that the descriptions must not be taken at face value but answering both of these questions requires a critical reading of the sources. The literate elite viewed themselves as different from—read: superior to—the general mob and often despised both their lifestyle and beliefs.[56] It is impossible here to give any detailed overview of the huge source material. Instead, I briefly discuss some examples representing different literary genres: tragedies, philosophical writings, and consolation literature.

From the fifth century onwards, there is a growing interest in the world of the dead in literature.[57] This is evident in both tragedies

[54] The very few exceptions are mainly found in the literary inscriptions of the *Anth. Pal.*, not in inscriptions found on actual sites. These, such as *Anth. Pal.* 7,320, view the deceased negatively but do not refer to punishments in the afterlife. Other examples are those inscriptions where victims of murder wish the same ill fate for their murderers (e.g., 7,357–60).

[55] Cf. Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 6–7.

[56] Cf. MacMullen, *Paganism*, 9.

[57] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 29–30; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 7.

and philosophical writings. Not only do tragedies constantly refer to the dead and the way the dead can affect the living, but they also describe the underworld and the conditions therein in a way not known in previous literature.[58] The most natural reason for this shift in literature is that it reflects a shift in collective beliefs. Even though tragedy does not describe "real life" and often uses exaggeration, this exaggeration only works if it is based on acknowledged ideas, or, to use Robert Parker's words, on "the fundamental structure of popular belief."[59]

Despite this increasing interest in affairs of the dead, it must be stressed that the basic element of tragedies was to demonstrate how divine justice was dispensed on earth.[60] Sometimes they even contain statements that seem to deny any postmortem existence as in the following fragment of Euripides:

> There is no mortal that does not suffer. One buries children and begets new ones and dies oneself. Mortals grieve over this, bearing earth to earth. But life must be reaped like a ripened crop; the one shall be, the other one shall not. Why lament over this as Nature orders this to pass; for there is nothing dreadful for mortals in the necessities.[61]

For this reason, many scholars deny that there is any "outspoken belief in immortality" in tragedies.[62] Outspoken or not, belief in a personal afterlife and postmortem judgment occurs here and there and supplements the worldly picture. If divine justice is not meted out on earth, it will be after death. The fact that the tragedies do occasionally speculate on otherworldly affairs and also refer to the personal fate of the dead seems to indicate that the idea of postmortem rewards and punishments was not alien to the Athenian audience.[63] The same holds true for comedies. As Johnston puts it,

---

[58] See, e.g., Aeschylus *Eum.* 269–73, 320, 388; *Suppl.* 230–32; Sophocles *Aj.* 832; *Oed. col.* 1556–78; Euripides *Alc.* 252–54, 361, 438–44, 744–46; *Hec.* 1–2; *Hel.* 1013–14; *Herc. fur.* 431–34, 1101–104; Aristophanes *Lys.* 605–7; *Ran.* 136–58, 186–87, 448–78.

[59] Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, 108. For a fuller discussion see Parker, "Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology," 144–48 and Sourvinou-Inwood, "Tragedy and Religion: Constructs and Readings," 161–63.

[60] Garland, *Greek Way*, 64.

[61] Euripides *Hyps.* (frg. 757; preserved in Plutarch's *Cons. Apoll.* 110f); cf. Euripides *Mel.* (frg. 536); Aeschylus *Cho.* 503–507.

[62] Lattimore, *Themes*, 45–46; cf. Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 7–8.

[63] Similarly Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 25: "If even in those plays where they [the dead and their world] do not occupy a central role, death and the dead persistently manifest themselves, then these were indeed topics that longed for expression and resolution in the fifth century."

> . . . the fact that at least three comedies about ghosts were written during the late classical period also confirms that a belief in ghosts was widespread—for how can one make comic something that is not taken at least a little seriously?[64]

The growing interest in otherworldly speculations is also clearly seen in philosophical writings with their eschatological myths and other discussions concerning the soul's survival after death. Most scholars regard these as exceptional; they are speculations within small philosophical circles that have nothing to do with ordinary people and their beliefs. Interestingly, though, quite a few scholars claim that philosophers, such as Plato and Plutarch, did not take their eschatological myths literally themselves.[65] Even though the myths are literary creations that must be attributed to the philosophers themselves, they did not intend them as revelations of the otherworld but used them for paraenetic purposes, to promote a philosophical way of life, for example. Be that as it may, it raises the question of where all the details of the descriptions, such as chasms and judges and meadows and fiery rivers, come from. One possibility is, of course, that they derive from some esoteric groups, such as a Pythagorean secret society, that are even further away from ordinary people. The other, and, according to the evidence, the much more likely possibility, is that the philosophers utilized well-known popular images to color their literary myths.[66]

Robert Garland, among others, admits that the otherworldly descriptions of Aristophanes and Plato contain "undoubted echoes of popular belief" in those features they share in common, but "at the best they merely serve as eccentric variants on a popular theme."[67] A little further, he continues:

> It seems clear that the Greeks were not much concerned to produce a consistent and clearly mapped-out picture of the landscape of Hades. [. . .] Landmarks such as the white rock, the myrtle groves, the plain of Lethe, the white cypress and the lake of Memory may all derive from a common tradition, but since we learn of their existence from

[64] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 28.

[65] On Plato, see n. 107 on p. 74. On Plutarch, see Donini, "Science and Metaphysics," 138–39; cf. pp. 92–93 above.

[66] According to Russell, Plutarch produced his eschatological myths on the basis of literary and popular tradition. The outcome is Plutarch's own; "he did not find the scheme as it is in earlier writers;" *Plutarch*, 74.

[67] Garland, *Greek Way*, 49.

> such a diversity of literary sources, and since no poet or painter has provided us with a synthesised view, it is perhaps safer to assume that the Greeks were as much in the dark about Hades as they have left us.[68]

This kind of logic is hard to follow. It seems to imply the problematic assumption that there is one, fixed popular tradition and all variations of it are "eccentric variants." More likely, the exact opposite is true. "Popular belief"—whatever is actually meant by the term—tends to fluctuate, vary and find different representations.[69] It is dubious whether any people at any time have a "consistent and clearly mapped-out picture" of the conditions and geography of the afterlife. Thus, the diversity of literary sources and the variations on common themes and descriptive details in them point more to the popularity and prevalence of these themes and less to indifference towards the matter.

In addition to the actual descriptions of the otherworldly conditions, there are passages that deal, more or less explicitly, with the beliefs that other people than the philosophers themselves hold concerning the fate after death. In Plato's *Republic*, the aged Cephalus declares:

> When a man begins to realize that he is going to die, he is filled with fear and anxiety about matters that before did not occur to him. The tales that are told about those in Hades—that those who have done wrong here must pay the penalty there—although they are ridiculed up to that time, then begin to disturb his psyche with the doubt that they might be true (*Resp.* 1,330d–e).

Cephalus' attitude certainly cannot be taken as representative of ordinary, non-philosophically minded people,[70] but the passage actually reveals two different attitudes. There are those, philosophically-oriented like Cephalus, who begin to fear death when it draws near, even though they have ridiculed it before. Then there are those who speak about punishments in Hades—quite likely the less-educated people.

Some might find an objection based on a passage in the *Phaedo*. There Socrates' companions, Cebes and Simmias, are not convinced that the soul survives death and refer to the opinion of most people

[68] Garland, *Greek Way*, 51.
[69] Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 22–25.
[70] Garland, *Greek Way*, 17–18.

(τὸ τῶν πολλῶν in 77b) that "... when the soul leaves the body it ceases to exist anywhere" (*Phaed.* 69e–70a). This, however, hardly reflects the belief of most Athenians.[71] First of all, such a claim runs against archaeological records that testify to regular provisions made for the dead.[72] Secondly, it is more likely that Simmias and Cebes are referring to "most people of their own kind", i.e., members of the educated class, and even then they may be partial.

Similar examples can be found in later texts from Hellenistic and Roman times. In his treatise entitled *That Epicurus actually makes a pleasant life impossible* (*Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum*), Plutarch claims that not very many people in his time feared "the doctrine and fabulous arguments of mothers and nurses" of "the fangs of Cerberus or having to carry water to a leaky urn" (*Suav. viv.* 1105a–b).[73] To understand the citation from Plutarch properly, however, we must take a look at its larger context (*Suav. viv.* 1104a–1106a). As the name indicates, the treatise as a whole is aimed against the Epicurean lifestyle and beliefs. Plutarch wants to show that the Epicurean belief in the dissolution of the soul at death cannot bring happiness. Were it true, the wicked could continue to act wickedly since they have nothing to fear, while the good and virtuous have no reward awaiting them. The Epicurean teaching is advantageous only for those who live a life of misery; for them, death would be a release. But for all who live a happy life, death would be a change from good into nothing. Thus Epicurus makes a pleasant life impossible.

Plutarch divides people into three categories (*Suav. viv.* 1104a): the evil-doers and the wicked (οἱ ἀδίκοι καὶ πονηροί), the ignorant masses (οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ ἰδιωτοί), and the upright and intelligent (οἱ ἐπιεικοὶ καὶ νοῦν ἐχόντοι). Then he relates these groups to different eschatological expectations. Fear of otherworldly punishments benefits the wicked for they are thus "... shocked into a state of greater honesty and restraint" (*Suav. viv.* 1104b). For the upright and virtuous, death means the beginning of a new and better life: "They regard death as so great and so truly perfect a blessing since they hold that in that otherworld the soul will live a real life, whereas now it is not fully awake but is living instead in a kind of dream" (*Suav. viv.* 1105d). The great majority also believe in the continuation of life after death.

---

[71] *Contra* Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 7–8.
[72] Garland, *Greek Way*, 75.
[73] All quotations from *Suav. viv.* are according to Einarson & de Lacy.

Thus Epicureans "... in abolishing belief in immortality they also abolish the pleasantest and greatest hopes of ordinary men (οἱ πολλοί)" (*Suav. viv.* 1105c). The passage is unlikely to mean that, according to Plutarch, only the wicked believe in punishments after death and only the good believe in blessings after death while most people believe in a neutral life after death. His division of the different beliefs serves his anti-Epicurean polemic. Since most people belong to the category of "ordinary people," they do not deserve the punishments of the wicked and do not expect the special favors granted to the virtuous but still believe in a pleasant life after death. Thus the word πολλοί does not denote how widespread such a belief is, but it indicates that most people are neither especially wicked nor especially virtuous.

Who, then, are the "not very many" who believe in the tales of mothers and nurses? They are those who believe that mystical rituals offer "an answering remedy" for the terrors of the afterlife. According to Plutarch, most ordinary people do not believe in punishments but live life "undisturbed by any myth-inspired fear." What frightens them is not the mythical judgments and punishments, but the idea that death means the dissolution of the soul (*Suav. viv.* 1104b–c).

Lucian, the second century C.E. satirist, maintains that it is the uneducated masses who fear punishments. In his writing *On Funerals* (*De luctu*), he complains that "... the general herd (πολὺς ὅμιλος), whom philosophers call the laity, trust Homer and Hesiod and the other mythmakers in these matters, and take their poetry for a law unto themselves. So they suppose that there is a place deep under the earth called Hades, which is large and roomy and murky and sunless" (*Luct.* 2).[74] Lucian is not often considered a very reliable witness.[75] It may well be that he is exaggerating in his description and there is no way of telling if the beliefs he claims for most people (οἱ πολλοί) really correspond to the most common view. What is interesting, however, is the attribution of several such features to Homer and Hesiod that do not derive from these poets but from much later times. These include rewards in the Elysian fields and punishments

[74] All quotations from the *Luct.* are according to Harmon. Cicero (*Tusc.* 1,48–49) and Seneca (*Marc.* 19,4–5) also maintain that the otherworldly punishments are mere tales.

[75] See Garland, *Greek Way*, 76.

in the Place of the Wicked (ὁ τῶν ἀσεβῶν χῶρος),[76] the ferryman who rows the dead across Lake Acheron,[77] the judges Minos and Rhadamanthys, the lake of Memory, etc.[78] This kind of shift in terminology is easy to understand as the Homeric concepts were given new meanings over the course of time. Probably Lucian and other people sincerely believed that otherworldly rewards and punishments belonged to the Homeric netherworld; perhaps they never had any difficulty in assimilating the traditional Homeric view with the idea of rewards and punishments after death.[79] This terminological shift makes it necessary to be very cautious when interpreting later sources, be they literary or epigraphic. A "Homeric" concept or term does not always denote a traditional Homeric view of Hades.

Another important literary genre for the discussion concerning life after death is that of consolations, whose aim was to combat grief through rational argument.[80] Consolations were offered to people facing different kinds of hardships, such as exile, ship-wreck, poverty, and aging, but the most common subject for a consolatory writing was death.[81] Both the rhetorical handbooks on consolation and the actual consolatory writings focusing on death make use of the belief in personal immortality.[82] Especially the rhetorical handbooks may reflect widespread beliefs since rhetorical credibility requires making use of popular opinions, not introducing new ideas.[83] It is also worth

[76] In Homer and Hesiod, these places were reserved for exceptional figures, immortal heroes and mythical opponents of the gods.

[77] The earliest known appearance of Charon is in two black-figure vase paintings from around 500 B.C.E.; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 303; cf. Garland, *Greek Way*, 55.

[78] Many features that occur in Homer are much developed in Lucian's satiric description. For example, the punishments of the wicked include being "racked, burned, devoured by vultures, turned upon a wheel; they roll stones uphill" (*Luct.* 8), in other words, the punishments reserved for mythical criminals in Homer have become open to all. Lucian calls the king of the netherworld Pluto, a name given to Hades centuries after Homer's time, see n. 47 on p. 63.

[79] In his dialogue *Menippus*, Lucian combines a Homeric Hades with a meadow of asphodel where shadows of the dead flit about squeaking and a judgment scene where Minos sends the wicked to the Place of the Wicked to be punished in proportion to the crimes committed (*Men.* 11–12). Cf. the Virgilian netherworld above pp. 82–83.

[80] For a recent discussion concerning the genre of ancient consolation, see Holloway, *Consolation in Philippians: Philosophical Sources and Rhetorical Strategy*, 55–83.

[81] Holloway, *Consolation*, 57.

[82] Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, 182. See also Martin & Phillips, "Consolatio," 402–403.

[83] Meeks, *First Urban Christians*, 241, n. 44.

emphasizing that the orations built upon the handbook models also reached the illiterate public.[84]

The literary genre of consolation may go back to Crantor, the most celebrated author of consolations,[85] who wrote in the beginning of the third century B.C.E. His writing *On Grief* (Περὶ πένθους) seems to have become a model for all subsequent consolations.[86] Probably following Plato's lead in Socrates' apology, Crantor introduced two possibilities concerning the afterlife:[87] either death means cessation of all sensations, like a deep sleep, or it is a passage from this life into a better one.[88] For example, in the Pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus*, Socrates first introduces the Epicurean teaching but that does not bring comfort to the dying man who complains that it is only a "part of the current chatter of the times" (*Ax.* 369d). But when Socrates has described the delights of the immortal soul after death, the dying man declares: "No longer do I have fear of death, but now I even have a longing for it" (*Ax.* 370e). Thus, even though the writing offers both alternatives, it clearly promotes the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul.[89]

An example of a rhetorical handbook is a treatise ascribed to the third century C.E. rhetor Menander of Laodicea where he gives advice for the composition of a consolatory speech.[90] According to him, the speech should consist of two parts, first a lamentation, then the consolatory part. It is advisable to begin the consolation proper with a quotation from Euripides or some other famous writer, then

[84] Martin acknowledges Meeks' point but notes that "'popular consumption' of any textually embodied expression in a largely illiterate society such as the Roman Empire would have been limited." *Corinthian Body*, 272, n. 17. He does not take into account that rhetors also addressed audiences that consisted not only of literate people.

[85] Cf. Cicero *Acad.* 2,44,135.

[86] See Hershbell, "Introduction," 19. The work no longer exists but it may be partially reconstructed, thanks to Cicero (*Tusc.* 1,115; 3,12–13) and Plutarch (*Cons. Apoll.* 102d–e; 104c; 114c–d).

[87] Cf. *Apol.* 40c.

[88] Many consolations offer both these alternatives in some form. For example, in his consolation to Marcia, Seneca first reminds her that death is a release from all suffering and Marcia's son now enjoys everlasting peace (*Marc.* 19,4–6). Later in the letter, he assures her that souls of those who are released from earthly life while young find their way above to the gods most easily (23,2). There the virtuous dead wander in the boundless space of eternity until the next ἐκπύρωσις (25,1–26,7). Cf. Plutarch, *Cons. Apoll.* 120e–121e; Dio Chrysostom, *Charid.* 28–44; Seneca, *Polyb.* 9,4–9.

[89] Souilhé, "Notice," 118–19; Hershbell, "Introduction," 21.

[90] Russell & Wilson, *Menander Rhetor*, 160–65.

the mourners should be reminded that death is inevitable; no one can escape it. Next the rhetor should refer to the life of the deceased, what he knows of it and, if the life was pleasant, offer assurance that the deceased has enjoyed it enough, but, if the life was miserable, recall that the deceased has escaped the pains of it. Then comes the consolation based on the blessed state of the dead:

> I feel convinced that he who has gone dwells in the Elysian Fields, where dwell Rhadamanthys and Menelaus, and the son of Peleus and Thetis, and Memnon. Or rather perhaps he is living now with the gods, traveling around the sky and looking down on this world (2,414,16–20).[91]

Thus Menander gives a choice between a blessed state in the (subterranean?) Elysian Fields or astral immortality with the gods. Both alternatives indicate individual treatment of the dead.[92]

An example of such a rhetorical model in actual use is Plutarch's treatise *Consolatio ad uxorem*. It is a letter of consolation to his wife on hearing of the death of their two-year-old daughter Timoxena. Only a perhaps surprisingly small part of the consolation is based on the fate that the dead receives. The main body treats other topics, the major emphasis being on restraining grief and controlling the emotions. The consolation proper (*Cons. ux.* 610d–612a) includes several subcategories: memories as a source of consolation, consolation from comparison (the present blessings outweigh the misfortunes), consolation from the daughter's present state beyond pain, and, finally, consolation from the immortality of the soul. Because the girl died young, she has not been entangled in this world but has quickly made the journey to the otherworld.

All in all, the consolations together with other sources from Greek and Roman antiquity attest to a diversity of views concerning the afterlife. Some held to the traditional Homeric belief of an undifferentiated existence, others envisioned more personal fates, beatific life with the immortal gods either in a subterranean paradise or in the air (astral immortality).

---

[91] Translation by Russell & Wilson.

[92] Martin & Phillips argue that the choice is between "the traditional Homeric underworld and the mystical-philosophical dwelling-place of the gods;" "Consolatio," 410. However, this cannot be true: the Elysian Fields with Rhadamanthys and others does not correspond to the Homeric view.

The evidence—neither literary nor epigraphic—does not support the scholarly view that the traditional, Homeric view was the popular view shared by the illiterate masses. We cannot say what an "ordinary" Greek or Roman thought about her or his fate after death but we can say that the belief in personal rewards and/or punishments was not restricted only to esoteric mystery cults or obscure philosophical speculations but was more common than often admitted in scholarly works.

# CHAPTER SEVEN

## DIFFERENTIATED FATES IN JEWISH SOURCES

When we turn to the Jewish sources of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, a similar kind of diversity emerges.[1] There was no single "Jewish" view of the afterlife but the sources attest a plurality of beliefs that coexisted side by side.[2] The history of Jewish ideas concerning life after death also seems to include a shift from an undifferentiated fate in a subterranean abode of the dead, Sheol,[3] into personal rewards and punishments.[4] Over the course of time, the righteous dead were imagined as joining God and his host in heaven and Sheol was envisioned as a place of punishment.[5] But

[1] There are several surveys with detailed analyses of the different sources such as Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr.—100 n. Chr.)*; Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*, Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* and the first volume of Puech, C*royance* (see n. 14 on p. 47 above). An excellent picture of the diversity of different Jewish beliefs can be constructed on the basis of the recent collection of essays *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*, eds. Avery-Peck & Neusner. Cf. also Bernstein, *Formation*, 133–202; Day, "Development," 231–57; Riley, *Resurrection*, 10–23; Segal, *Life after Death*, 120–70 and 248–321.

[2] This diversity naturally concerns many other issues as well. For this reason it is often claimed that we cannot speak of a single Judaism in antiquity but instead should differentiate among "Judaisms," see, e.g., Neusner's quite polemical "Introduction" in Avery-Peck & Neusner (see previous note). It is very true that, in their self-understanding, different groups distinguished themselves sharply from each other which makes it as impossible to define a single Judaism as it is to define a single Christianity in antiquity (or today). Yet from the outsider's point of view, there was no difficulty in determining who was Jewish and who was not. On a social level, then, there were enough "common denominators"—a term fiercely attacked by Neusner in his "Introduction"—which is why I prefer to speak of diversity within Judaism instead of different Judaisms. Cf. the discussion in Hakola, *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*, 25–29.

[3] For the etymology of the word, see Day, "Development," 231–32.

[4] The similarity between Greek and Jewish ideas in this respect is emphasized by Bernstein, *Formation*, 50.

[5] Jeremias, ᾅδης, 147. In the traditional three-layered worldview, the abode of the dead was situated beneath the earth, while heaven was the abode of the immortals. In the words of P. Davies ("Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls," 190): "Corresponding to the "underworld" of Sheol is the "overworld," the heavens, the sky. [. . .] Just as the realm of Sheol comprises an existence

also the same problems that prevent from reconstruction of any clear "development" of Greek concepts apply to Jewish sources: they are few and ill-representative in the sense that they only reflect the views of literary and priestly circles.

## 7.1. The Fate of the Dead in the Hebrew Bible

The Hebrew Bible seems to give a fairly consistent view of the fate of the dead. The ideas concerning life and death are tied closely with the belief in God's justice. According to the Deuteronomistic thinking, obedience brings about blessings and life both to the individual and the community, disobedience causes condemnation and death.[6] God's judgment is enacted on earth. The reward of righteousness is a long life, the models for which are the patriarchs like Abraham who "died in a good old age, an old man and full of years" (Gen 25:8). Sheol, the abode of the dead, is a dark and gloomy place where all the deceased continue a similar shadowy existence, comparable with the Homeric Hades.[7] Existence in Sheol can hardly be called "life" after death—if such qualities as dignity, reputation, prosperity, and a large family characterize life.[8] None of these exist in Sheol.[9] The deceased are separated from Yahweh and cannot praise him or put their trust in him.[10] The life of individuals after death continues in their progeny and the memories of the living.[11]

that is less than human life, so existence in *Shamayim* is more than human life." Cf. Jacobs, "Jewish Cosmology," 67–70; McDannell & Lang, *Heaven*, 3–4.

[6] Nickelsburg, "Judgment, Life-after-Death, and Resurrection in the Apocrypha and the Non-Apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha," 141.

[7] Bauckham, "Hades. Hell," 14. It also closely resembles the Mesopotamian "land of no return;" J. Davies, *Death*, 63; Segal, *Life after Death*, 118.

[8] Murphy, "Death and Afterlife in Wisdom Literature," 102.

[9] This is the *communis opinio* shared by most scholars. Others, however, assume that texts such as 1 Sam 28:14; Isa 14:9; Ezek 32:17–32 indicate that not all the dead share a similar fate but earthly conditions effect the conditions in the netherworld. See Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 70.

[10] Isa 38:18; Pss 6:6; 30:10; 88:11–13; 115:17 [psalm numbering follows here and elsewhere the Hebrew text.] Cf. Job 7:9; 10:20–22; 14:12–14; 16:22; Eccl 9:5–10.

[11] Remembrance of the dead was important because the dead "lived" only as far as there were people who remembered them. Gradually, as the generations passed, the most remote ancestors "died" from the memory of their descendants. The only exceptions were the great heroes of the past. This is compatible with the

In the Hebrew Bible, the world of the dead is sharply separated from the world of the living. All contact between the living and the dead is strictly prohibited.[12] However, the Hebrew Bible is "the canonized document of official Yahwistic religion"[13] and the inclusion of the prohibition against necromancy in the law probably reflects the fact that it was actually practiced.[14] Although necromantic practices are often associated with "popular belief," the clearest example of necromancy in the Hebrew Bible is connected with King Saul when he consults a witch to get in contact with the spirit of Samuel (1 Sam 28).[15] The archaeological evidence also points to a cult of the dead, similar to the neighboring cultures.[16] Whether this means that the ancient Israelites practiced ancestor worship or not is hotly debated.[17] The distribution of funerary offerings does not give a definite answer. The offerings may be simply for providing sustenance for the deceased, not for worshipping them.[18] Commemoration cults of the dead were important as they legitimized the claims of the living to birthright and land ownership.[19] It is also not quite clear whether official Yahwism was against these practices from the beginning,[20] or

belief concerning life after death in many non-literate cultures, for example some African tribal cultures, where a distinction is drawn between recently dead and more distant dead. Only a very few exceptionally memorable of the distant dead are active and can affect the living as the recently dead do. See Ries, "Immortality," 248–56.

[12] See Exod 22:17; Lev 19:27–28,31; 20:6,27; 21:5; Deut 14:1; 18:10–11; 1 Sam 28; 2 Kgs 23:24; Isa 8:19.

[13] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 237; cf. Segal, *Life after Death*, 141.

[14] Segal, *Life after Death*, 131. The prohibition also indicates that, within the official cult, the contact with the dead was deemed possible, if undesirable. See McDannell & Lang, *Heaven*, 2–11, even though the development of Jewish concepts is hardly as straightforward as they present it.

[15] See Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 257. He calls necromancy an "under-current in the ancient religion of Israel next to the mainstream of Yahwism." For an opposing view, see B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, 281–93.

[16] Friedman & Overton, "Biblical Silence," 36–37; cf. Bloch-Smith, *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs about the Dead*, 147–51; Lewis, *Cults*, 176–77.

[17] See the survey of Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 28–54.

[18] Thus recently, e.g., B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*, 274–80.

[19] B. Schmidt, "Memory as Immortality: Countering the Dreaded 'Death after Death' in Ancient Israelite Society," 94. Cf. Halpern, "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century B.C.E.: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability," 57–59.

[20] Some scholars interpret Deut 26:14 as a prohibition against offering tithed food to the dead and therefore conclude that other food offerings are not disallowed; Brichto, "Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—A Biblical Complex," 29; Bloch-Smith,

only after the exile.[21] The question is whether the dead are seen as powerful—so that the living must honor them to propitiate them—or powerless.[22]

Alongside this rather uniform view of Sheol and the dead, the Hebrew Bible contains some exceptions. Two individuals, Enoch and Elijah, are said to have escaped death.[23] The end of Enoch, a righteous man from the distant past,[24] is described mysteriously: "he was no more for God took him" (Gen 5:24). It is possible that the author simply meant to say euphemistically that "Enoch died,"[25] but later it was understood that Enoch was literally snatched away by God to forever be with him.[26] Elijah, the great prophet, is carried up to heaven in a whirlwind and is no longer found upon earth (2 Kgs 2:1–18).[27] These traditions seem to indicate that it is possible, at least for especially virtuous individuals, to continue their relationship with Yahweh. In later sources, this hope is no longer restricted to exceptional figures but to all righteous ones.

*Judahite Burial Practices*, 122–23, 146–47. Others refute this; e.g., B. Schmidt reads the verse as reflecting "the custom of giving food as an act of consolation and nourishment to those in bereavement over the loss of a loved one;" *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, 193–200.

[21] According to Friedman & Overton ("Death and Afterlife: The Biblical Silence," 49), one reason for the reserve on the part of official Yahwism was the fact that

> specialists were not needed at all to propitiate the good will of the deceased and accrue blessings. The best way for an ancient Israelite to ensure health, prosperity, and fertility was to propitiate the family's dead ancestors. This did not require a priest, it brought no income to the priesthood, and it could even compete with priests' income and authority.

[22] Cf. Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 37–81.

[23] Moses is also a somewhat exceptional case. He died like everybody else but instead of "being gathered with his fathers" like the other patriarchs he is said to have been buried by Yahweh so that nobody knew his burial place; Deut 34:6. This might imply that Moses did not descend to Sheol with the other dead but somehow Yahweh took care of him. At least this is the way the passage was later read; see Day, "Development," 239–40.

[24] Enoch only appears in the genealogy from Adam to Noah in Gen 5. Enoch is distinguished from all the other persons mentioned as he is the only one who is told to "walk with God" (vv. 22 and 24).

[25] Cf. Pss 39:14; 103:16; Job 7:21. Thus, e.g., Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1: From Adam to Noah*, 285. For a different opinion, see Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 267–68.

[26] It is no coincidence, then, that at least three apocalyptic writings were later ascribed to Enoch. Who could be a better mediator of divine secrets concerning fate after death?

[27] For more on Enoch and Elijah, see Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 258–69; Day, "Development," 237–39.

One possible way of envisioning this continuation of being with Yahweh is resurrection. Since Yahweh is stronger than death, he can give a new life to the dead. Belief in resurrection is clearly a late strand in the Hebrew Bible, often associated with the rise of apocalypticism. The only clear reference to it is in Daniel 12. In verses 2–3, it is said:

> Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever.

Even though this passage is universally accepted as a statement of resurrection, several details of the description are debated.[28] There is no unanimity on whether Daniel envisions the resurrection of all or only some (the very righteous and the very wicked) and whether the resurrection is restricted only to Israel or are non-Israelites also included.[29] The context seems to support the interpretation that only the righteous of Israel and their wicked persecutors are intended.[30] However, it remains unclear whether Daniel envisions a bodily resurrection[31]—even though this is often taken for granted[32]—or something more spiritual. The interpretation depends on whether the many and the wise refer to the same group of people. If they do, then there is no room for any earthly resurrection but the righteous will be raised to celestial life.

Some scholars also find traces of resurrection or other forms of a more positive afterlife in other texts.[33] An example of such a passage is Isaiah 26:19:

---

[28] Cf. Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 26.

[29] Hasel, "Resurrection in the Theology of Old Testament Apocalyptic," 277–80.

[30] Cf. Dan 11:33–35. Thus also Collins, "Afterlife," 126; Segal, *Life after Death*, 292–93.

[31] Collins, *Daniel*, 392.

[32] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, 23; Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 27; Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15*, 87.

[33] According to Spronk, traces of a more positive afterlife can be found in Pss 16, 49, 73, 103; Job 19:25–27; Isa 26:7–19; 52:13–53:12; Ezek 37: 1–14; *Beatific Afterlife*, 285–338. Spronk is criticized by Day, "Development," 235–36. The disagreement is especially strong concerning Psalms. Dahood claims that there is a reference to eternal life in about 40 passages in Psalms; *Psalms* 1, xxxvi, 2, xxvi–xxvii, 3, xli–lii. His view, however, has not found support. Puech reduces the allusions to resurrection to Psalms 16, 17, 49, and 73; *Croyance*, 46–59. According to Day, the only psalms that refer to vindication for the righteous after death are Psalms 49

> Your dead shall live, their bodies shall rise, the dwellers in the dust shall awake and sing for joy, for your dew is a dew of light, and the earth shall give birth to the shades.

Some see here evidence of literal resurrection,[34] others maintain a metaphoric reading, an image of the restoration of Israel after the exile, similar to Ezekiel 37.[35] There is no decisive solution to the problem. It is quite possible that Isaiah 26:19 did not originally refer to concrete resurrection but, after the belief in resurrection was accepted, the passage was obviously interpreted along those lines.[36]

The origins of belief in resurrection are another highly disputed question. Previously they were sought in Zoroastrianism[37] but lately many scholars explain the rise of belief in resurrection as an intra-Jewish development.[38] The distance between the conviction of Yahweh's unlimited power, apparent, for example, in the revivification of the dead by such "men of God" as Elijah and Elisha, and the belief in Yahweh's ability to raise the dead is not great.[39] It is quite possible that impulses from neighboring cultures inspired the Jewish resurrection belief but it must be once again stressed that a totally strange conception would hardly be adopted.[40] The adoption of religious ideas implies that the new ideas must have some familiar base for them.[41] It is likely, then, that even though the Hebrew scriptures are

and 73; "Development," 253–56. Goldingay refutes even that; "Death and Afterlife," 78–81. In his view, there is no room for a belief in a positive afterlife in Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes (p. 61).

[34] E.g., Puech, *Croyance*, 71–72.

[35] Hasel, "Resurrection," 271–75; Day, "Development," 243–44.

[36] Cf. Segal, *Life after Death*, 260–61.

[37] Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 506–20. Recently Lang, "Street Theater, Raising the Dead, and the Zoroastrian Connection in Ezekiel's Prophecy," 307–14. See, however Barr, "The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity," 218–19. The Avesta is an extremely difficult source as it is written in a "highly poetical and cryptic style" and especially as its oldest manuscripts are Medieval; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 47–50; cf. Shaked, "Iranian Influence," 311–13. Bremmer also questions the Zoroastrian influence on Ezek 37 (defended by Lang, "Street Theater," 309–12) as it is uncertain how important a role Zoroastrianism played in Babylonia in the beginning of the sixth century B.C.E.

[38] Day, "Development," 242–47; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 50.

[39] Cf. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 281–83; Segal, *Life after Death*, 175.

[40] Cf. above p. 57.

[41] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 85. He cites (on p. 55) the words of G.F. Moore:

> Borrowings in religion . . ., at least in the field of ideas, are usually in the nature of the appropriation of things in the possession of another which the borrower recognizes in all good faith as belonging to himself, ideas which, when once they become known to him, are seen to be necessary implications or complements of his own.

very restricted in their views concerning any personal afterlife, at least some rudiments of such ideas were accepted in some circles among the Israelites as well. Thus, it is an oversimplification to see a linear development from a period of total rejection of any belief in personal life after death to a "full-blown" apocalyptic belief.[42]

## 7.2. Apocalyptic Eschatology and Personal Afterlife

The term "apocalyptic" is notoriously tricky; even though everybody seems to know what it means, it is difficult to give an unambiguous definition that would cover all the diverse material and phenomena that have been labeled apocalyptic.[43] Even if we take the word to refer to a certain type of revelatory literature,[44] it is not easy to determine what actual writings belong to the genre.[45] Two different

[42] This is strongly emphasized by Friedman & Overton, "The Biblical Silence," 55–56.

[43] "Apocalyptic" has been associated with a specific literary genre, a historical movement, and a worldview with distinctive theological or ideological features. The relations among these different aspects have been under lively discussion; see, e.g., Rudolph, "Apokalyptik in der Diskussion," esp. pp. 772–82, Grabbe, "Introduction and Overview," 16–24 and Collins, "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe," 44–47. It is customary to make a distinction between apocalypse (literary genre), apocalypticism (social ideology), and apocalyptic eschatology (a set of ideas that may also appear in other literary genres than apocalypse and other social settings than apoclypticism); thus, e.g., Hanson, "Apocalypticism," 29–31; cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2–12. Whatever way "apocalypse," "apocalyptic" and "apocalypticism" are defined, the terms do not refer to a single unity. We can legitimately talk about an "apocalyptic movement," such as early Christianity or the Qumran community, but these two represent different kinds of apocalyptic movements with common but also distinctive features.

[44] See the definition of apocalypse as a genre by Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*, 7. The apocalyptic genre was not limited only to Jewish-Christian culture but also appears in Gnostic, Greek, Latin, and Persian literature; see Fallon, "Gnostic Apocalypses," Attridge, "Greek and Roman Apocalypses," and Collins, "Persian Apocalypses" in *Semeia* 14.

[45] Collins includes in the list of Jewish apocalypses the book of Daniel, *1* and *2 Enoch*, 4 Ezra, *2* and *3 Baruch, Apocalypse of Abraham, Apocalypse of Zephaniah, Testament of Abraham, Jubilees* and *Testament of Levi* chaps. 2–5; *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 6–7; "Jewish Apocalypses," 28. The limits of the genre are not easy to draw as apocalypse can occur as a subsidiary form in other types of writings (*T. Levi* and *Jub.* are cases in point.) *1 En.*, which undoubtedly must be counted among the apocalypses, also combines different styles and not all its parts contain apocalyptic features (as traditionally defined). Additionally, there are other writings that are closely related to the genre such as the *Sibylline Oracles* and testamentary literature. The Qumran documents pose a problem of their own. None of them can be defined with certainty as an apocalypse in the strict sense of the word yet the worldview in many of them is typically apocalyptic; see Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 9–11.

types of apocalypses can be distinguished.[46] The historical apocalypses, such as Daniel, give a review of history, often in a highly schematized form. Typically, they envision the end of history with retribution for the wicked and the vindication for the righteous. The second type, the accounts of otherworldly tours, concentrates on cosmological speculations such as the movements of the heavenly bodies or the powers that maintain the cosmos and usually lack eschatological interest. In spite of this, the otherworldly tours have bearing on questions concerning the afterlife as they often describe the geography of the hereafter at length. Features typical of apocalypses, such as heavenly tours, visions mediated by an angel, and most importantly for our purposes, retribution after death, also occur within different genres of literature.

The roots of Jewish apocalypticism are clearly in the prophetic tradition[47] but the growth of apocalypticism was a complex process that combined many different kinds of allusions to a wide range of sources such as ancient Near Eastern myths[48] and mantic wisdom,[49] Persian thought,[50] and Greek ideas.[51] Thus the origins of apocalyptic cannot be reduced to a simple adaptation of this or that thought.

---

[46] Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," 14–15.

[47] See, e.g., Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," 384–88. The prophetic background was refuted by von Rad (*Theologie des Alten Testaments 2*, 314–21) who opted for wisdom tradition as the source of apocalypticism; cf. n. 49 below. Wisdom tradition was certainly one source of inspiration for apocalyptic imagination but that does not diminish the significance of prophetic tradition for the birth of apocalypticism.

[48] Clifford, "The Roots of Apocalypticism in Near Eastern Myth," 5–29.

[49] The importance of mantic wisdom in understanding apocalyptism, was proposed by Müller, "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik." Kvanvig has investigated the Mesopotamian mantic traditions, see n. 22 on p. 49 above. VanderKam emphasizes that Israelite prophecy, which was a broader phenomenon than the activity of the great literary prophets of the Hebrew Bible (as "prophecy" is often understood), included a mantic element; "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," 248–54.

[50] The extent of Persian influence on Jewish apocalypticism is debated; see the discussion in Hultgård, "Persian Apocalypticism," esp. pp. 79–81. There are clear analogies between Persian and Jewish apocalyptic thinking in their penetrating dualism and periodization of history. If these analogies are generic by nature, it is possible that the Persian thought became familiar to the Jews through the Hellenistic world; see Barr, "Question," 218–19.

[51] Culianu traces the apocalyptic tradition to Greek iatromantes—a term coined by E.R. Dodds from ἰατρές and μάντες—healers and seers connected with ecstatic phenomena; *Psychanodia*, 35–39; cf. *Expériences*, 25–43. Downing shows that a cosmic catastrophe was not a distinctively Jewish and Christian eschatological trait but also appears in many pagan Greek and Roman sources; "Common Strands." An overall Greek influence on Jewish eschatology is stressed by Glasson, *Greek Influence*.

Surely many "foreign" elements that circulated widely in the Hellenistic world were adopted but they were not simply taken over but reshaped and integrated with the traditional thinking.[52] Apocalypticism, as any religious movement, was not a unity that stayed unaltered. It was living tradition that found new and different expressions in different writings.

The definition of "apocalyptic eschatology" is likewise problematic.[53] Its relation to prophetic eschatology is especially debated.[54] Generally speaking, it may be said that, while the earlier prophetic eschatology hoped for a worldly restoration of Israel for a finite if lengthened time,[55] apocalyptic eschatology envisions a transcendence of death, a personal afterlife.[56] The postmortem retribution is set in a cosmic perspective.[57] However, instead of two distinctive categories, prophecy and apocalypticism should be understood as being on the same continuum. Both are forms of divination with several common features.[58] Whatever way the two categories and their mutual

[52] Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 33–34. According to him, apocalypticism was essentially a child of Hellenism: "In the broadest sense the matrix of Jewish apocalypses is not any single tradition but the Hellenistic milieu, where motifs from various traditions circulated freely."

[53] The whole concept of "apocalyptic eschatology" has been questioned by, e.g., Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*, 25–29. He is quite right in emphasizing that the diverse eschatological speculations "are not easily reduced to terse summaries which encapsulate apocalyptic eschatology in a sentence or two" (p. 29). There never was such a thing as "the" apocalyptic eschatology, only different eschatological schemes within apocalypticism that do not make up a coherent system. Not all apocalypses describe the end of history. However, as Collins points out, "an approach that denies the essential role of eschatology [in apocalypses] is an overreaction and no less one-sided." *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 10.

[54] For a recent discussion, see Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking," 109–18.

[55] According to Gowan, the Hebrew Bible eschatology, except for the book of Daniel, is not concerned about the end of the world (or of time or of history) but of the end of evil, such as sin, human infirmity, hunger, war, etc. The present world is wrong and in need of radical change but, after this change, it will still be this same world, only transformed to exclude all sin; *Eschatology in the Old Testament*, 2.

[56] The apocalyptic expectations do not necessarily exclude a worldly restoration; an earthly paradise (sometimes with a transformed, angelic dimension) seems to be implied in *1 En* 51:5; *Apoc. Ab.* 21:6; *Sib. Or.* 4,187–91; *2 Bar.* 51:3,8–11; perhaps also in *T. Dan* 5:12–13. In some writings, most notably 4 Ezra 7:26–28 and *2 Bar.* 29:3–8, the earthly paradise is associated with a temporary Messianic age before the final judgment.

[57] VanderKam, "Prophecy and Apocalyptics in the Ancient Near East," 269; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 11–12,261.

[58] Grabbe suggests that apocalypticism should be seen as a subdivision of prophecy; "Introduction," 21–23; cf. "Prophetic and Apocalyptic," 129–30. He points out that

relationship are defined, it is justified to speak of apocalypticism as a category of its own, even though the limits are not entirely clear.[59] Late prophetic texts, such as the books of Zechariah and Ezekiel with their visions, differ from earlier prophetic texts but also from the later apocalypses.[60]

It is also important to note that apocalyptic eschatology appears in many different forms. For example, the transcendence of death is not always connected with the future otherworldly life but is sometimes believed to begin in the present life.[61] The time span between early apocalypses such as *1 Enoch* and Daniel and later texts such as 4 Ezra and *2 Baruch* is several centuries and it would be quite misleading to talk about one and the same phenomenon under the title "Jewish apocalypticism,"[62] let alone to try to make a clear-cut system out of it with a coherent and harmonious view of life after death.

In earlier scholarship, the apocalyptic expectation of postmortem rewards and punishments was explained as an answer to the question of theodicy in the time of religious persecution. According to this view, God's ultimate judgment and the vindication of the righteous were transferred to the otherworld since during the Seleucid persecution, it was precisely the righteous who lost their lives while the apostates were allowed to live. It can certainly be said that the Maccabean revolt "gave a great boost" to apocalypticism[63] but recently scholars have emphasized that the relation between the two is not as simple as formerly maintained. First, the speculations on the geography of heaven and the abode of the dead together with the fate

---

one reason for distinguishing between prophecy and apocalypticism is the (wrong) assumption that prophecy had come to an end and was replaced by apocalypticism. This is not the case, however. As VanderKam notes, the writers of apocalypses often saw themselves as prophets and called their writings prophecies (see, e.g., Rev 1:3; 22:18–19); "Prophetic-Sapiential Origins," 245.

[59] In my view, the question of definition is not solved simply by reducing apocalypticism to a late strand of prophecy, as argued by Grabbe (see previous note). If, on the one hand, we only speak of prophecy, there is a risk of using "a definition so broad that it ceases to have a meaning" like Grabbe himself puts it in another context (concerning millenarian movements; "Introduction," 28). On the other hand, distinguishing between "earlier" and "later" prophecy takes us back to the initial problem of defining categories. Cf. Collins, "Prophecy," 50–51.

[60] See the discussion on the similarities and differences between Ezekiel and *1 Enoch* in Himmelfarb, *Tours*, 57–60 and *Ascent*, 9–28.

[61] The Qumran community seems to have held such a belief, see further below.

[62] Collins, "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death," 31.

[63] Collins, *Daniel*, 396; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 47.

of the dead is older than the Maccabean era, as witnessed by the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* found at Qumran.[64] They attest that intellectual speculations concerning the secrets of the cosmos circulated as early as the third century B.C.E. Second, it is doubtful whether there was concrete religious persecution behind all the apocalyptic speculation. The groups that produced apocalyptic writings were dissatisfied with life in the present and probably felt that they were marginal and powerless,[65] but this self-identity does not necessarily mean actual physical violence.[66]

Thus, the hope for the revivification of the dead was not an invention created as an answer to the distress caused by the Seleucid oppression. The relationship should rather be seen the other way around: the apocalyptic expectation explains, at least partly, the steadfastness of the martyrs in the face of their persecutors.[67] It is possible that the religious oppression—first by the Seleucid kings and later by the Romans—resulted in a shift of emphasis from intellectual speculations concerning the structure of the cosmos to more eschatologically-oriented thought.[68] However, the cosmological interest did not disappear but is a crucial part of some later apocalyptic writings.[69]

### *1 Enoch* 22

The above considerations do not change the fact that the apocalyptic writings bear witness to a new outlook on life after death not known in previous prophetic literature. A salient feature of this outlook is the postmortem retribution and vindication, which presupposes a division between the righteous and the wicked in the hereafter.

---

[64] Milik dates the Qumran manuscript 4QEnastr[a] (containing the Astronomical Book, *1 En.* 72–82) to the end of the third or the beginning of the second century and 4QEn[a] (containing the Book of the Watchers, *1 En.* 1–36) to the first half of the second century B.C.E.; *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*, 273. As the manuscripts are copies, not autographs, the treatises were probably composed in the third century B.C.E. The scholarly consensus regards the Book of the Watchers as a composite work using diverse earlier sources which might be even older. See, e.g., Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, 7.

[65] Especially in the last chapters of *1 Enoch*, the so-called Epistle of Enoch, the struggle between the righteous and the sinners is depicted as social tensions and sinners are identified as the rich, the powerful, and the mighty.

[66] Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 38; "Afterlife," 127–28.

[67] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 343.

[68] Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in Third Century B.C.E.," 195–97.

[69] *2 En.*, *3 Bar.* and *T. Ab.* are cases in point.

The oldest clear references to such apocalyptic eschatology are found in the earliest parts of *1 Enoch*, especially in the Book of the Watchers (chaps. 1–36).[70] The Book of the Watchers, which draws heavily from the prophetic tradition of Ezekiel,[71] is itself a composite of earlier traditions and, as a result, its eschatological references do not form a coherent picture. The introduction of the book seems to imply a prolonged life on earth[72] but Enoch also learns of otherworldly prisons for both heavenly and human sinners where they await in darkness a final judgment and destruction. The spirits of the righteous wait for the judgment and resurrection.[73]

On his cosmic tour, Enoch sees the place where the spirits of the dead are gathered (*1 En.* 22:1–13):[74]

> (1) Then I visited another place, and he showed me in the west another great and high mountain of solid rock (2) and in it four hollow[75] places

[70] *1 Enoch* is commonly divided into five parts: the Book of the Watchers (chaps. 1–36) that relates the story of the Watchers and the cosmic journeys of Enoch; the Similitudes (chaps. 37–71) that consists of three eschatological "parables;" the Astronomical Book (chaps. 72–82) with cosmological speculations concerning the movements of the sun, moon, and stars; the Book of Dreams (chaps. 83–90), an account of Enoch's two visions concerning the history and end of the world; and the Epistle of Enoch (chaps. 91–104), a paraenetic "testament" of Enoch to his sons. The end of the book (chaps. 105, 106–107) consists of fragments from originally independent writings that are probably later interpolations, chap. 108 is an editorial conclusion; see Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments 2*, 14–15; Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, 22–23. In its entirety, *1 En.* is only preserved in an Ethiopic translation but Aramaic, Greek and Latin fragments are also known. The original language of the book is probably Aramaic; see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 9. An English translation based on the Ethiopic text is found in Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch* and *OTP* 1,13–89 (by Ephraim Isaac). Black's translation, which is based on Charles' revised translation in 1912, takes into account some variants of the Aramaic and Greek manuscripts; *Book of Enoch*, 25–102.

[71] Himmelfarb, *Tours*, 50–60; cf. *Ascent*, 73.

[72] *1 En.* 5:7; cf. 10:17–11:2.

[73] The punishment of the fallen angels and stars: *1 En* 10:4–6; 18:14; 19:1; 21:2,10; the prison and judgment of the sinners: *1 En.* 22:10–13; 27:2–3; the place of the righteous: *1 En.* 22:9; cf. 25:5–6 (the paradisiacal Jerusalem).

[74] The translation is based on the Greek text found in the so-called Codex Panopolitanus (often also referred to as the Akhmim manuscript.) that contains chaps. 1–32. Unfortunately, the manuscript contains several problems both in its linguistic form and its content; Wacker, *Weltordnung und Gericht: Studien zu 1 Henoch 22*, 88. See her detailed text critical discussion of chapter 22 on pp. 40–91. On the other hand, the Ethiopic text, which differs somewhat from the Greek, is no more helpful in this respect. The Aramaic fragments only contain vv. 3–7 and 13.

[75] In the Ethiopic version, the places are not "hollow" but "beautiful" (both here and in v. 9). This is probably due to a translator's mistake in reading the Greek text: he has read καλοί instead of κοῖλοι; Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 108.

that were deep and very smooth, three of them dark and one luminous and a spring of water in the middle of it.[76] And I said: "How smooth are these hollows and very deep and dark to view!" (3) Then Raphael, one of the holy angels who was with me, answered and said to me, "These hollow places [are here] in order that the spirits of the souls of the dead might be gathered in them. They were appointed for this very reason so that all the souls of people[77] might be gathered here. (4) And these places were made for their gathering until the day of their judgment and until the division and the appointed time when the great judgment will be upon them." (5) I saw dead people who were making accusations and his voice was reaching until heaven and was making accusations.[78] (6) I asked Raphael, the angel who was with me, and said to him, "Whose is this spirit that is making accusations, wherefore his voice advances thus and makes accusations until heaven?" (7) And he answered me saying, "This spirit is the one that left Abel, whom Cain, his brother, killed. Abel accuses him until his seed is destroyed from the face of the earth, and his seed is removed from among the seed of the people." (8) Then I asked about all the hollows,[79] why they were separated one from the other. (9) He answered me saying, "These three were made to separate the spirits of the dead. And thus it is separated for the spirits of the righteous, where [there is] in it the luminous spring of water. (10) And thus it is created for the sinners, when they die and are buried in the earth and judgment has not come upon them in their lifetime. (11) Here their spirits are separated in this great pain, until the great day of judgment and scourges and torments of the accursed forever, and there is[80] retribution

[76] Again, the Ethiopic version differs from the Greek manuscript. The Ethiopic version is unintelligible and probably contains errors in both reading and translation; cf. Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 55; Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 108. On the other hand, the Greek text is also problematic as the following sentence seems to indicate that all the hollows are dark. In v. 9, it is the spring of water that is luminous, not the hollow place where the spring is situated. It is possible that the idea of a separate luminous place for the righteous reflects a later expansion of a text that originally spoke of an unspecified number of dark hollows; Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 122–31.

[77] The Ethiopic text agrees with the Aramaic which reads "the souls of all the children of the people."

[78] The Ethiopic text speaks about "spirits of the dead people" that are making accusations. In the Greek version, there is something odd as the sentence begins in the plural ("dead people") and continues in singular ("his voice"). As the passage only talks about one dead person who makes accusations (Abel), Charles has amended the whole text into the singular: τεθέαμαι ἀνθρώπου νεκροῦ ἐντυγχάνοντος. See Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 109–10. This would correspond to the Aramaic version that speaks of only "a dead man making accusation."

[79] The Ethiopic version reads "about the judgment" which would also make sense. The immediate context seems to favor the Greek version.

[80] The Greek verb is quite unsuitably in the past tense: ἦν ἀνταπόδοσις τῶν πνευμάτων.

> of the spirits. There he will bind them forever.[81] (12) And thus it is separated for the spirits that make accusations, who make manifest the destruction, when they are killed in the days of the sinners. (13) And thus it is created for the spirits of the people who will not be righteous, but sinners and will be partners with the lawless.[82] The spirits, because they are afflicted here, are punished less, they will not be visited with vengeance on the day of the judgment, nor will they be raised from there.

The description combines several traditions about the afterlife.[83] The result is complex and so contradictory that it is impossible to get an exact picture of the otherworldly conditions. This is due either to careless copying or the conflation of different views or probably both. It remains unclear how many different departments there are and for whom they are reserved. Verse 2 speaks clearly of four different hollows but in v. 9 there are only three of them. The Greek text supports the originality of the former;[84] there is a clear fourfold structure with the expression καὶ οὕτως that is used repeatedly in vv. 9b, 10, 12, and 13. The mention of only three places in v. 9 can be explained in several ways. It may refer to the three other places, not counting the place where Abel resides that is described in vv. 5–7. The logic falls apart, however, when the place for those who make accusations concerning their death is mentioned again in v. 12.[85] On the other hand, it may refer to the three hollows reserved for sinners. Thus the angel points out that these three are separated from the one reserved for the righteous with the spring of water in it (v. 9b).

---

[81] Some Ethiopic manuscripts have a plural: "They will bind them forever." It is not clear who is the binder, God (singular) or angels (plural)?

[82] Again, the tense used (future) is somewhat surprising.

[83] The origins of the description are studied in detail by Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 132–233. She points out that, in most ancient cultures, the abode of the dead is situated in the west. A depiction of the abode of the dead as a mountain and as an underworld prison also occurs in several cultures. Thus, it is clear that the Enochic description reflects several traditions, many of which originate outside of Judaism but there is no point in making sharp distinctions between Jewish and "foreign" elements in it (p. 218). Her own suggestion is that the description originally included only vv. 1–4 where all the spirits of the dead were said to be gathered without any distinctions. This has its closest counterparts in Babylonian mythology (pp. 173–77). Vv. 5–13 were later added and reflect mostly Greek ideas such as the differentiation of the dead according to their moral quality, an underworld prison, a distinction between different kinds of sinners, and a spring of water in the abode of the righteous (pp. 200–201, 211–19).

[84] See the discussion in Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 103–31. According to her, the original number of the hollows was four.

[85] This is suggested by Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 110–11.

The question concerning the number of the places is closely related to their function; how many different categories of spirits are there and on what grounds are they separated?[86] If there are four hollow places, are two of them for the righteous and two for the wicked, or are three reserved for the wicked and one for the righteous? What is clear in the description is that there is one hollow separated from the others for the righteous dead (v. 9b). This place differs from the others as it has a refreshing spring of water in it.[87] It is equally clear that there is another hollow for those sinners who have not been punished in their lifetime. On the day of judgment, they will be faced with just retribution (vv. 10–11).

The rest remains obscure. It is possible that both the righteous and the wicked are divided into two groups.[88] In that case, v. 12 would describe a place for the righteous martyrs (cf. vv. 5–7) and v. 13 a place for those sinners who have received due punishment while alive. They would not be punished after death but neither would they have a share in the resurrection. This is an appealing suggestion as it would make a beautiful balance and would correspond with the partial resurrection envisioned in Daniel 12.[89] On the other hand, it is not without problems. First, if there are two places for the righteous, why is only one place more pleasant than the others? Moreover, why do the "ordinary" righteous have the better waiting place, not the righteous martyrs who would deserve a special compensation after death?[90] One solution might be that the martyrs will receive their compensation in resurrection while the "ordinary" righteous, who have enjoyed their full lifetime on earth, will not be resurrected but will enjoy a blessed life in Sheol by the spring of water.[91] This is not entirely impossible but the less attractive

[86] Different possibilities are discussed by Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 137. Cf. Glasson, *Greek Influence*, 17–18.

[87] According to the problematic verse 2, the hollow also differs from the others because it is luminous (cf. n. 76 on p. 131 above) In v. 9, however, it is the spring itself that is luminous. In the words of Black (*Book of Enoch*, 167):

> The author of Enoch seems to envisage all souls or spirits of the dead as "existing" in four dark canyons in the mountains of the west, held in custody there till the last judgment; only the condition of the righteous seems to have been alleviated by the presence of a stream of fresh water. The ancient concept of Sheol has not been wholly lost.

[88] Thus Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 110–111; Puech, *Croyance*, 109–13.

[89] Glasson, *Greek Influence*, 17–18.

[90] Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 308.

[91] Cf. Glasson, *Greek Influence*, 17.

waiting place for those righteous who should deserve the best is hardly satisfactory. Moreover, the resurrection of the righteous is nowhere explicitly stated, even if it can be inferred from v. 13; the idea that only the very wicked would be resurrected is highly improbable.[92] If there is a division between righteous martyrs and the other righteous, this is not developed any further.[93] A better counterpart for the righteous martyrs would be their own oppressors, as in Dan 12.[94] However, the sinners who will be resurrected to face the judgment are not contrasted with the martyrs. Thus it is more probable that all the righteous will rise.

If there is no need to divide the righteous, then, are they all in one place (with the spring of water)? That would mean that the remaining three are for the sinners. This would correspond well to v. 2 in the Greek version. The biggest problem with this solution is that v. 12 is difficult to read as a reference to sinners. Why would sinners be described as making accusations (ἐντυγχάνω) in the same way as Abel in vv. 5–7? The formulation refers rather to righteous martyrs even though these spirits are not explicitly called such.[95] Further, why should this category of sinners be separated from the other sinners? If the passage originally spoke only of three places for the dead, v. 12 might be understood as referring to the same people as v. 13. They would be sinners whose earthly punishment has been an untimely, violent death. The expressions used in v. 12, however, do not seem to support this solution. On the other hand, Abel is not necessarily a prototype of a righteous martyr, either. In the older tradition, he was understood to be morally neutral; Josephus is the earliest source that depicts him as righteous.[96] If this is so, the accusers in *1 Enoch* 22 may also be understood as neither sinners nor righteous.

If it is not clear to what class of people v. 12 refers, v. 13 is, if possible, even more obscure. Who are these people? Alan E. Bernstein

---

[92] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 136.
[93] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 137.
[94] And also in the Epistle of Enoch, see further below pp. 175–82.
[95] According to Puech, these are martyrs who still need purification, cf. 2 Macc 12:38–45; *Croyance*, 112. This, however, is a rather far-fetched conclusion.
[96] See Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 182–84. Abel is also understood as a righteous martyr in the Q saying behind Lk 11:50–51//Mt 23:35–36. The Lukan version reads: "This generation may be charged with the blood of all the prophets shed since the foundation of the world, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah."

follows the Ethiopic version which speaks of "perfect criminals" and understands this group to represent thoroughly corrupt and incurable sinners.[97] According to him, the punishment of these incurable is that they may never leave Sheol. The other group, those sinners who did not suffer in life (v. 10) are being tested. If they curse (v. 11), they will be bound forever. Those who do not curse may be released as they have already been adequately punished (v. 13). This kind of interpretation comes close to the idea reflected in Plato's dialogues. It is a different matter, however, whether it is possible to make such far-reaching conclusions on the basis of the condensed description. Moreover, unlike the Ethiopic text, the Greek does not speak of "those who curse" but of the "accursed." Matthew Black offers a contrasting reading.[98] He translates the relative clause that defines the sinners in v. 13: those ". . . who were not wholly lawless, but with the lawless they collaborated." This group, then, represents the "fellow-Jews who were the accomplices of the Gentile oppressors." This reading is too bold, to say the least; it is questionable whether there is any support for it in the text (the future tense predicate ἔσονται makes it untenable) or in the assumed historical setting.

The end of v. 13 seems to imply that this group of sinners consists of the ones who have received their punishment during their time on earth.[99] Then the other group of sinners, who have avoided their punishment on earth, will deserve a harsher punishment in the otherworld. Only these will be judged (v. 11) while those who have already received their punishment are not judged but are not allowed to leave Sheol, either, but continue to live there eternally (v. 13).[100] Thus, the text seems to make a distinct division among the sinners but not so distinct among the righteous. However, the basic division, that the righteous will receive a better lot than the wicked, is obvious. No matter how the details are interpreted, it is clear that, according to the description in *1 Enoch* 22, the souls of all people are taken to Sheol where they face different fates according to their earthly lives.

---

[97] Bernstein, *Formation*, 185–86.

[98] Black, *Book of Enoch*, 38, 168.

[99] This is not stated explicitly but must be inferred since they must be somehow distinguished from the sinners in v. 10; Glasson, *Greek Influence*, 15–16.

[100] Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 110–11; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 168. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 308.

The similarities between the basic division among the dead in *1 Enoch* 22 and Luke's story of the Rich Man and Lazarus have often been noted.[101] Most recently, Larry Kreitzer has pointed out the many similarities between these two accounts.[102] These similarities, together with the reference to Cain and Abel, make him suggest that *1 Enoch* 22 forms the basis for Jesus' formulation of the example story:

> Could it be that the setting of vindication that the story of Genesis 4 sets up was a common one and that it provides Jesus with the germinal thought upon which he builds his parable in 16:19–31? One might well ask if the whole parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is Jesus's attempt to answer, in a story form, that very question from Genesis 4:9. Are we our brother's keepers?[103]

Despite the obvious cultural intertextuality between *1 Enoch* 22 and Lk 16:19–31, it is certain that Kreitzer pushes his point too far.[104] There is no reason to assume that the Lukan example story is based on a particular vindication story, either the description in *1 Enoch* 22 or some oral story based on it. However, the divine retribution or reward after death reflected in *1 Enoch* forms the larger matrix in which Luke's example story is also rooted.[105]

The fate of the dead described in *1 Enoch* 22 is not final, at least not for all spirits, since they are said to await judgment (v. 4.) The intermediate waiting place for the righteous is pleasant while the sinners seem to suffer already (v. 11: ". . . their spirits are separated in *this* great pain.")[106] The destiny after the judgment remains undefined.

---

[101] Grensted, "The Use of Enoch in St. Luke xvi. 19–31," 333–34; Standen, "The Parable of Dives and Lazarus and Enoch 22," 523.

[102] Kreitzer, "Luke 16:19–31,"141. For details, see the discussion on pp. 268–69.

[103] Kreitzer, "Luke 16:19–31," 141.

[104] See the critique of Griffiths, "Cross-cultural Eschatology," 8–11. According to him, "the best thing in his article was his concluding tribute to Albert Schweitzer," while his "remarks on the ancient sources and possible influences seem [. . .] less acceptable" (p. 8).

[105] This common eschatological frame is also acknowledged by Griffiths, ("Cross-cultural Eschatology," 11) even though he opts for the Gressmann hypothesis according to which the example story is based on "a story current in the oral tradition" with "an ultimate source" in Egypt (p. 9).

[106] Cf. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 136. Differently Bauckham, "Early Jewish Visions of Hell," 53, n. 13. According to him, the phrase cannot mean present sufferings since "no fire or other means of punishment are mentioned: the "hollows" for the souls of the wicked are simply dark. It may mean that the wicked have already been set apart for torment at the last day. If it refers to present torment, the reference must be to a kind of anguished fear of the judgment to come to which

On the basis of v. 13, it may be concluded that the judgment means punishment for some, and resurrection for others. This resurrection is not depicted in bodily terms; what is expected seems to be some kind of a "resurrection of the spirit or soul."[107]

The final bliss of the righteous is described in *1 Enoch* 25:5–6 where it is understood as a return to renewed, earthly life. Enoch sees another high mountain, which the angel says is the throne of God, and a fragrant tree, the tree of life. Enoch is told:

> Its fruit will be food[108] for the elect for life and it will be transplanted in the holy place by the house of God, the Eternal King. Then they shall rejoice with joy and be glad and they shall enter into the holy (place). Its fragrances (shall be) in their bones and they will live a longer life on earth which your fathers lived. And in their days pain and plagues and scourges shall not touch them.

The passage indicates an earthly restoration with a prolonged (but not eternal) life.[109] It is not obvious how these different ideas of an earthly paradise and an otherworldly judgment are related to each other.[110] The final destiny of the sinners will be in an "accursed valley" (φάραγξ κεκατηραμένη, *1 En.* 27) where they will have their dwelling-place.[111] This is a clear allusion to Gehenna (and the valley of Hinnom) even though the name is not mentioned.[112]

---

4 Ezra 7:79–87 refers." This is quite possible as the text remains ambiguous. What matters is that the sinners are aware of their punishment.

[107] Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 41–42. This means that the souls are envisioned to be raised from the underworld Sheol to some other realm, either earth or a heavenly abode. A comparable view can be found in *Jub.* 23:30–31:

> At that time, the Lord will heal his servants, and they shall rise up and be made whole, and drive out their adversaries. The faithful shall see and be thankful, and rejoice with joy forever, and shall see all their judgments and all their curses on their enemies. Then their bones shall rest in the earth, and their spirits shall have much joy; and they shall know that it is the Lord who executes judgment, and shows mercy to hundreds and thousands, and to all that love him. (Trans. in Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 99.)

[108] The manuscript has εἰς βορρᾶς (in the north), which does not make sense. It is probably a misspelling of εἰς βορρᾶς (for food).

[109] The righteous will live "a longer life" (ζωὴν πλείονα) like their (probably antediluvian) fathers, not an eternal life (ζωὴν αἰώνιον).

[110] Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 56.

[111] The text is not quite clear. The Greek text reads: "And here will be (their) dwelling-place (οἰκητήριον), in the last times, in the days of the true judgment, before the righteous for all time." The judgment will take place in the accursed valley but will the sinners dwell there forever? The Ethiopic text does not speak of dwelling, only of judgment.

[112] Cf. further below pp. 271–74.

### *Other Apocalypses*

The description in *1 Enoch* 22 with the presumably fourfold division of the dead remains unique in early Jewish literature. In later writings that continue and elaborate the traditions of Enoch and Daniel, a division into two groups, the righteous and the sinners, becomes settled. The most extensive treatments of postmortem conditions are found in 4 Ezra[113] and *2 Baruch*.[114] Both writings combine several originally independent traditions, such as immediate retribution after death, bodily resurrection, transformation into angelic form, and a Messianic age, into what appears not always to be a very harmonious whole. Especially 4 Ezra struggles with the question whether the otherworldly retribution takes place immediately after death or only after the judgment on the last day.[115] The answer is: both.

The fate of the dead is described at length in 4 Ezra 7.[116] It is a part of a longer section (6:35–9:25), a dialogue between Ezra and the angel Uriel concerning whether the eternal punishment of sinners, who comprise most of humankind, can be reconciled with the

[113] The naming of the different books associated with Ezra forms a confusing chapter in the history of the pseudepigrapha. I follow the tradition of separating chapters 3–14 of the composite work usually named 2 Esdras and call this originally Jewish document 4 Ezra. It is clear that chaps. 1–2 (= 5 Ezra) and 15–16 (= 6 Ezra) are later Christian additions. See Knibb, "Commentary on 2 Esdras," 104–105; Myers, *I and II Esdras*, 107–108. 4 Ezra is usually dated to the end of the first century C.E., after the destruction of Jerusalem. In any case, it was known and cited by Clement of Alexandria at the end of the second century (cf. *Strom.* 3,16 where Clement quotes 4 Ezra 5:35). 4 Ezra was distributed widely; it is known in a Latin manuscript and there are also Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic, Coptic and Georgian fragments. The original language has been either Greek or Hebrew/Aramaic.

[114] *2 Bar.* was also written after the destruction of Jerusalem. The writing is known only in a Syriac manuscript. It is probably a translation from Greek, which might be a translation of an older Hebrew text. The writing is closely related to 4 Ezra but the question of the direction of influence is disputed. *2 Bar.* is usually considered later than 4 Ezra, see Thompson, *Responsibility*, 149, n. 1. The majority view is that the books are not literarily dependent but make use of a common source (or sources). Both writings are composites of different apocalyptic material. 4 Ezra is comprised of seven visions that Ezra is supposed to have had in Babylonia. They are presented in seven different visions. *2 Bar.* contains three eschatological visions in the midst of other varied material, such as prayers, lamentations, and exhortations to the people.

[115] In 7:75, Ezra asks explicitly: "at death, when every one of us gives back his soul, shall we be kept at rest until the time when you begin to create your new world, or does our torment begin at once?" The question shows that the ancients were also confused with the different views on the fate of the dead.

[116] Cf. *2 Bar.* 23–30.

idea of God's love for his creation.[117] Ezra inquires why the majority of people are sinners and thus will be punished, and only a few are saved. According to the divine answer, God is merciful to all and wants no one to be lost. Those who will be lost can only blame themselves for not keeping the law and being faithful to God (4 Ezra 8:59–60). On the other hand, the new world is only for the few precious ones, who are few "like precious stones are few amidst the clay" (4 Ezra 7:49–61). This would imply that the sinners were created not for their own sake but for those who will be saved. The majority, then, only form a dark background against which the light of the righteous shines even more brightly.

The soul separates from the body at death to return to its maker and immediately experiences its future fate (4 Ezra 7:78–99). That is why the wicked grieve in advance, and the righteous rejoice:

> (79) But those who have rejected the ways of the Most High and despised his law, and hated all that fear God, (80) their spirits will not enter into chambers, but roam immediately in torments, grief, and sorrow, in seven ways. (81) The first way, because they have despised the law of the Most High. (82) The second way, because they now cannot make a good repentance so that they may live. (83) The third way: they can see the reward in store for those who have trusted the covenants of the Most High. (84) The fourth way: they consider the torment that awaits them in the last times. (85) The fifth way: they see the chambers of the others guarded by angels in deep silence. (86) The sixth way: they see that they are soon[118] to enter into torment. (87) The seventh way, the strongest way of all: that they break down in shame, waste away in regret, and wither with fear when they see the glory of the Most High, before whom they sinned in their lifetime, and before whom they will be judged in the last times.
>
> (88) Now for those who have kept to the way of the Most High, this is the order[119] when they will be separated from their mortal bodies. (89) During the time that they lived in it they served the Most High in spite of constant hardship and danger, and kept perfectly the law given them by the lawgiver. (90) Therefore this is their reward: (91) first they see with great joy the glory of God who will receive them, and they have rest in seven orders. (92) The first order: because they have struggled the long fight to overcome their impulses to evil that were formed in them, which have failed to lead them astray from

[117] Knibb, "2 Esdras," 100.
[118] The Latin is obscure here; "soon" is based on Syriac manuscripts.
[119] The Latin uses the word *ordo* both here and in v. 91 (seven orders or stages, *per septem ordines*); cf. the seven ways (*per septem vias*) in v. 80.

> life to death. (93) The second order: because they see the confusion in which the wicked souls wander, and the punishment in store for them. (94) The third order: they see the witness given of them by their Maker, that throughout their life they kept the law entrusted to them. (95) The fourth order: they understand the rest that they now are to enjoy in the storehouses guarded by the angels in deep silence, and the glory waiting for them in the last times. (96) The fifth order: they rejoice in that they have escaped the corruptible world and in the future life that they will inherit, and they see that they have been set free from the cramped and toilsome[120] life and that they will receive the spacious life to enjoy in immortality. (97) The sixth order: when they will be shown that their face is to shine like the sun, and how they are to be made like the light of the stars, never to be corruptible. (98) The seventh order, the greatest of all: that they will rejoice in confidence, without fear and shame, as they press forward to see face to face the One whom they served in their lifetime, and from whom they are now to receive their reward in glory.

The future rewards and punishments are on display for seven days. After this time has passed, the righteous are led into chambers (*promptuaria*) where they may rest in silence, guarded by angels to wait for the end of days (7:85, 95).[121] The fate of the wicked is to roam around without rest (7:80).[122] A similar view is reflected in *2 Baruch* (30:2–5). The righteous wait in chambers until they are raised in the end of days. The fate of the sinners is not described in detail but they "wither away" when they see the righteous rejoicing and when they know that the time of their perdition is at hand. Thus, in both texts, the fate immediately after death reflects the coming, final and permanent destiny.

According to both writings, there will be a Messianic age at the end of time (4 Ezra 7:28–29. *2 Bar.* 29).[123] When it is over, the world

---

[120] Again the Latin is obscure; it has *plenum* "fullness." The correction is based on Syriac and Ethiopic.

[121] Cf. 4 Ezra 4:35, 40–42. It is not clear from the description where these chambers are situated. On the basis of v. 4:41, it has been concluded that they might be beneath the earth (*in inferno*) but the text is difficult to interpret. On the discussion, see Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 99. It is clear, however, that vv. 4:40–42 speaks about dead souls not unborn children as Glasson suggests; *Greek Influence*, 39–40.

[122] On the other hand, vv. 7:32 and 101 seem to imply that *all* the souls (both the righteous and the wicked) are led into chambers. According to Stone, "this is a clear example of the problem raised by the application of rules of consistency to a mode of thought to which they do not apply;" *Features of the Eschatology of IV Ezra*, 144–45.

[123] According to 4 Ezra, the Messianic age will last for 400 years. After this time, everyone, even the Messiah, will die. *2 Bar.* does not reveal the length of the Messianic age.

will come to its end and the time of judgment will be at hand (4 Ezra 7:26–30; *2 Bar.* 30). Then the earth will give up the dead that are buried in it and Hades will give up the souls that rest in its chambers (4 Ezra 7:30–32; *2 Bar.* 42:8; 50:2).[124] The soul and the body are apparently reunited to face the judgment. The result of the judgment for the righteous is a transformation into a luminous angelic state while the wicked are destroyed (4 Ezra 7:33–44; cf. *2 Bar.* 44:15; 51:7–16). In the description in 4 Ezra, a place of rest (*locus requietionis*)[125] and a paradise of delight (*iocunditatis paradises*) are reserved for the righteous, a pit of torment (*lacus tormenti*) and the furnace of Gehenna (*clibanus gehennae*) for the wicked.[126] According to *2 Baruch*, the destiny of the righteous is a paradise on earth. The New Jerusalem and paradise, which were both created at the beginning of time, are held by with God waiting for the coming age (*2 Bar.* 4:2–6).[127]

The different details of the description do not form a clear picture. The bodily resurrection seems somewhat superfluous; it is only needed for the judgment and the recognition of the dead while the ultimate goal is angelic life.[128] The introduction of the Messianic age creates further problems as it seems to require two resurrections.[129]

---

[124] Cf. 4 Ezra 4:40–42; *1 En.* 51:1; *L.A.B.* 3:10. In 4 Ezra 4:40–42, the chambers of the souls are compared to the womb: as little as a woman can keep the child in her womb from coming out when labor begins, the chambers of the souls will also give up their contents when the number of the souls has been completed.

[125] The reward of the righteous is also called rest in 4 Ezra 7:38, 75, 85, 95; *2 Bar.* 73:1; *1 En.* 11:2; 39:3–5; *Jos. Asen.* 8:11; 15:7; 22:9 [the verse numbering of *Jos. Asen.* follows C. Burchard in his article "Ein vorläufiger griechischer Text von Joseph und Aseneth".]

[126] Even though there are two terms that describe both the destiny of the righteous and that of the wicked, it is natural to interpret this to be due to parallelism so that there are really only two places, one for the good, one for the evil. This is similar to *2 Bar.* 59:4–11 where Moses is said to receive a revelation concerning the secrets of the cosmos in Sinai. He sees "the mouth of hell," "the place of revenge," "the place of faith," "the place of hope," and "the likeness of the coming torment." Here also actually only two fates are described. This is in contrast to Bauckham who seems to understand the passage of 4 Ezra as referring to several different places as in *1 En* 22; "Early Jewish Visions," 64.

[127] The kingdom of peace and the messianic age are described in chaps. 73–74.

[128] Collins, "Afterlife," 131.

[129] According to 4 Ezra 7:28 the Messiah will appear with companions ("those that are with him") which probably refer to the patriarchs and other holy figures of the past; Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 83–84. Cf. *2 Bar.* 29–30 where the resurrection seems to take place only after the Messiah has returned to heaven from his earthly reign. In Cavallin's words, these unevennesses are due to "classical harmonization of two originally independent ideas."

The details of the geography of the otherworld also remain obscure.[130] What seems to be expected, however, is an intermediate state of the dead between their deaths and the resurrection. In this respect, 4 Ezra and *2 Baruch* clearly continue the Enochic tradition.[131] This state is different for those who have been obedient to God's law and for those who have despised it. Thus, paying heed to the law and living accordingly is a common theme in both these apocalypses and the Lukan example story. In all three descriptions, judgment is based on the (dis)obedience to God's will.

A quite different picture concerning the judgment is depicted in the *Testament of Abraham*,[132] an apocalypse[133] perhaps from the first century C.E.[134] The writing differs from the above-introduced apocalypses in two respects. Unlike Daniel, *1 Enoch*, 4 Ezra, and *2 Baruch*, it derives from the Hellenistic Diaspora.[135] Further more, it is not a

---

[130] The geography of the otherworld is explicitly stated to be beyond the reach of human knowledge in 4 Ezra 4:7–8. Humans are not able to answer questions such as "where are the paths out of the grave, and the roads into paradise?" since "I have never been down into the deep, I have not yet gone down into the grave, I have never gone up in to heaven." Cf. *2 Bar.* 59:5–12, where the secret knowledge given to Moses consists precisely of those elements which Ezra proclaims beyond the realm of human knowledge, paradise and Gehenna included. Cf. Stone, *Features*, 279, n. 500.

[131] A similar idea occurs also in *L.A.B.* 19:12; 23:13; 28:10.

[132] The text is preserved in two recensions, priority of which is usually given to the longer version (Recension A); Nickelsburg, "Structure and Message in the Testament of Abraham," 92–93; cf. "Eschatology," 47–60. The texts of both recensions together with an English translation are in Stone, *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions*. See also the translation by Sanders in *OTP* 1, 882–902.

[133] Despite the name, *T. Ab.* is not a representative of the testament genre as it lacks nearly all the typical features of the genre (a father addressing his sons before an imminent death, a first-person discourse, etc.) Nickelsburg calls it "a parody on the genre—a non-testament;" "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times," 62. It can be debated whether the writing can be called an apocalypse but this classification seems the most proper as the heavenly tour forms a crucial part of the narrative; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 251–52. Differently, Kolenkow, "Genre Testament," 146–47; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 8. Rowland, who understands the term apocalyptic more in the terms of a religious outlook than of a particular literary genre, simply lists *T. Ab.* as one of the apocalyptic writings; *Open Heaven*, 15.

[134] Opinions concerning the dating of *T. Ab.* vary considerably. According to Nickelsburg, the range of opinions are from the first century B.C.E. to the fifth or sixth century C.E.; "Stories," 64. Cavallin gives a range between the second century B.C.E. and the second century C.E.; *Life after Death*, 96. The dating to the first century C.E. is based on a comparison with other Hellenistic Jewish writings; see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 252; Sanders in *OTP 1*, 874–75.

[135] The long recension probably originated in Egypt. Some have argued for a Palestinian origin for the shorter text but that is based on the supposition of a Hebrew original, which is far from certain; Nickelsburg, "Stories," 64.

historical apocalypse but a representative of the other type, the otherworldly journey. The text relates the last days of Abraham's life. The archangel Michael is sent to Abraham to announce his death but Abraham refuses to go with him. Instead, he begs to be taken on a heavenly journey. The request is granted but after his tour, the personified Death comes to Abraham to finally fetch him. Abraham still refuses to die and Death succeeds only by deceit (*T. Ab.* A 20:8–10).

On his tour, Abraham witnesses the judgment of the dead (*T. Ab.* A 11–14). This judgment takes place individually, immediately after the death of each person[136] and no general judgment at the end of the world is anticipated.[137] Abraham sees two paths at the first gate of heaven, one narrow and the other one wide, and two gates on them (chap. 11). Only a few are lead through the narrow gate. They are the righteous who will be taken into paradise. The multitude are taken through the wide gate. They are the wicked who are led into destruction and eternal punishment. Again, the report is not logically constructed since the judgment only takes place *after* the souls have arrived in heaven through these gates.[138] Moreover, Michael tells about three different judgments that face each soul.[139] The immediate transport of the souls into paradise or torments after death makes the account of the *Testament of Abraham* resemble the Lukan example story more than the previously mentioned writings. The greatest difference between them is the actual scene of judgment. In Luke's account, there is no mention of judgment but the rich man

[136] The different features of the judgment scene have been explained as due to Greek or Egyptian influence. Most details, however, occur in earlier Jewish literature. Some details, such as the trial by balance, may reveal Egyptian influence; see Nickelsburg, "Eschatology in the Testament of Abraham: A Study of the Judgment Scene in the Two Recensions," 29–40.

[137] Recension B alludes to a general resurrection "seven thousand ages" after the death of Abraham. Then "all flesh will be raised" (*T. Ab.* B 7:16). How this resurrection is related to the immediate judgment at the death of each individual is not explained.

[138] The scene of judgment and different paths for the good and the evil resembles Plato's description in *Resp.* 10,614c–d. In the Platonic account, however, the proper path is designated to the souls only after the judgment.

[139] Cf. Nickelsburg, "Eschatology," 40–47. In his view, these contradictions can be explained as expansions of tradition. On the other hand, it may well be that the composer of the writing never thought of the judgment in terms of logic. This is also seen in the depiction of a soul whose sins and good deeds are balanced and who is neither handed over to destruction nor to salvation (chap. 14). Through which gate did that soul arrive at the judgment?

only finds out, as if by surprise, that he is to be tormented while Lazarus is consoled.

### *Other Accounts of Differentiated Fates*

Ideas comparable with an apocalyptic view of the afterlife with its division between the dead also occur in other types of Jewish literature.[140] A Platonic type of the immortality of the soul occurs, perhaps for the first time in Jewish literature, in the Wisdom of Solomon.[141] In chapters 1–5, the writing addresses the question of theodicy: why do the wicked prosper while the righteous suffer in this life? The answer is evident: God's justice operates in human lives despite the seeming injustice.[142] Death and immortality are present realities, sinners are already dead and the righteous are immortal, and these states continue unbroken immediately after physical death.[143] However, the author seems to also envision a future judgment where the righteous judge their former oppressors (Wis 5:1–2; cf. 3:8–9). Thus, the overall eschatological picture of the Wisdom of Solomon is far from apparent. The author does not seem to be interested in any eschatological timetable. What is important is that the righteous are exalted and the wicked perish (Wis 3:1–13; 4:16–20; 5:15–23).

The so-called testaments also often include apocalyptic sections.[144] The setting in the testaments is usually at the deathbed of a patri-

[140] A good example is the *Biblical Antiquities* by Pseudo-Philo. It is not an apocalypse but a lengthy chronicle of the history of Israel from Adam to the death of Saul. Like 4 Ezra and *2 Bar.*, it is motivated by the trauma of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. and shares close affinities with the two; Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," 109. The similarities with 4 Ezra also include many linguistic parallels; James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, 54–58. *L.A.B.* extends its historical scheme to the future; after the evil age comes to an end, there will be a universal resurrection and judgment. The righteous will be blessed with immortality and the presence of God while the sinners will be destroyed in eternal fire (cf. 16:3; 19:12; 23:6; 63:4.)

[141] Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 25–32. In his words, "the author of Wisd, though clearly under the influence of Jewish tradition, was not necessarily being innovative even from the Greek point of view, but was simply aligning himself with that Middle Platonic position which was most congenial to his own way of thinking" (p. 28). The writing is dated between 220 B.C.E. and 50 C.E. Winston (p. 23) prefers the reign of Caligula (37–41 C.E.) as the likeliest period for the writing.

[142] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 88–89; Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 126–27.

[143] Nickelsburg, "Judgment," 152–53. A similar kind of concept of realized eschatology also occurs in *T. Job* 39:11–40:3 and *Jos. Asen.* 15:3–4; 16:14 and many of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see further below pp. 151–53.

[144] Most notably *T. Levi* 2–5 but also the other writings in *T. 12 Patr., T. Mos.*,

arch or other holy figure. Many of the testaments are written in the form of a farewell speech.[145] Thus, it is only natural that the dying patriarch reveals something of the fate of the dead. This is evident in the most extensive testamentary writing, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[146] Even though the different testaments are firmly rooted in the Deuteronomistic tradition,[147] they also contain eschatological speculations concerning the evil spirits and the Devil,[148] the Messiah,[149] and the resurrection of the dead.[150] The differentiated fate of the sinners and the righteous is a salient feature in many of them.[151]

An impending death gives occasion for speculations concerning life after death in other types of literature as well. Second Maccabees and its accounts of the deaths of the Jewish martyrs under the Seleucid oppression (2 Macc 6:18–7:42) heavily emphasize God's just judgment that will be meted out to both the righteous and the wicked. God's justice may be enacted on earth, as in the traditional Deuteronomistic scheme,[152] but if it is not, it will take place after death.[153] This requires resurrection, which is described in very concrete, bodily terms. The third martyred brother holds out his tongue and hands

---

and *T. Job* reflect an apocalyptic worldview. The *Sibylline Oracles*, a collection using the traditional Greek oracular genre, is also closely related to apocalypses; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 116–27.

[145] The prototype of this type of text can be found in the Hebrew Bible, especially in Gen 49 where Jacob blesses his sons before his death. Cf. the farewell speeches of Moses (Deut 33), Joshua (Josh 23–24), Samuel (1 Sam 12) and David (1 Kgs 2).

[146] The work is composite and, in its final form, Christian. However, it draws extensively from Jewish traditions, some of which were known at Qumran. The earliest traditions probably derive from the Hasmonean period. See Hollander & de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, 17–27.

[147] Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 136, 139.

[148] *T. Sim.* 5:2–3; 6:6; *T. Levi* 3:3; 19:1; *T. Jud.* 20:1; *T. Iss.* 6:1; 7:7; *T. Zeb.* 9:8; *T. Dan* 5:10–11; *T. Naph.* 8:4–6; *T. Ash.* 6:2–5.

[149] *T. Reu.* 6:8–12; *T. Sim.* 7:2; *T. Levi* 4:2; 8:4–17; 18:2–14; *T. Jud.* 22:2–3; 24:1–6; *T. Zeb.* 9:8; *T. Dan* 5:10–13; *T. Naph.* 8:2–3; *T. Jos.* 19:11–12; *T. Benj.* 11:2–5. Some of these clearly contain Christian overtones.

[150] *T. Sim.* 6:7; *T. Levi* 18:14; *T. Jud.* 25:1–5; *T. Zeb.* 10:2; *T. Benj.* 10:6–10.

[151] *T. Sim.* 6:2–6; *T. Levi* 18:9–14; *T. Jud.* 25:4–5; *T. Zeb.* 10:2–3; *T. Dan* 5:11–13; *T. Naph.* 8:5–6; *T. Ash.* 6:4–5; *T. Benj.* 10:8–11.

[152] This is the case with, e.g., the Jewish traitors Jason and Menelaus. The former dies in a faraway land and receives "no funeral of any sort and no place in the tomb of his ancestors (2 Macc 5:10)." The latter is executed by the Seleucids (2 Macc 13:3–8). Also, those Jewish soldiers who wore amulets of idols under their garments die in the battle (2 Macc 12:29–41). See van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*, 166.

[153] Thus, the unjust fate of the martyrs and the high priest Onias is vindicated posthumously.

and declares: "The God of heaven gave me these. His laws mean far more to me than they do, and it is from him that I trust to receive them back" (2 Macc 7:10–11).[154] The writer finds a Biblical basis for his belief in the prophecies of Second Isaiah. The language which Isaiah used referring to exile and return is now interpreted as referring to resurrection.[155]

What is clear about the resurrection in 2 Maccabees is its bodily form. Yet other aspects connected with it remain more obscure. It is not certain who will be resurrected. Is it only the righteous or also the wicked?[156] Is it all the righteous or only the martyrs?[157] Moreover, it is not evident where the resurrection takes place, in an earthly paradise or in heaven.[158]

---

[154] The faithful elder, Razis, who commits suicide instead of breaking the law, is also said to have taken his entrails, flung them at the crowd and prayed to the Lord to give them back to him again; 14:46.

[155] Nickelsburg, "Judgment," 149–50.

[156] The wicked may be excluded since, in 7:14, the fourth brother says to the king: "There will be no resurrection to life for you." On the other hand, the emphasis may lie on the word *life*; the resurrection for the tyrannical king does not lead to life but destruction. Postmortem punishment may be implied in 6:26, even though that is not certain. In 12:44–45, Judas is said to have prepared a sin-offering for the dead idolatrous soldiers (cf. n. 152 above). The writer praises Judas:

> If he had not been expecting the fallen to rise again, it would have been foolish and superfluous to pray for the dead. But since he had in view the wonderful reward reserved for those who die a godly death, his purpose was a holy and pious one. And this is why he offered an atoning sacrifice to free the dead from their sin.

The passage might imply punishment after resurrection but it may also be interpreted that the atoning sacrifice enabled resurrection for those who would not otherwise be resurrected.

[157] Van Henten strongly emphasizes that the resurrection concerns only the martyrs; *Maccabean Martyrs*, 172–73, 174–75, 181. According to him, this means that 2 Macc differs from Dan 12, where there are "many" who are resurrected; p. 173, n. 205. This, however, need not be so. First, 2 Macc 7 concentrates only on the vindication of the seven brothers and their mother and retribution for their oppressors; nothing is said concerning other righteous. Moreover, the dream of Judas in 2 Macc 15:12–16 may imply that pious figures of the past, like Onias and the prophet Jeremiah, already enjoy resurrection life; for the interpretation of this passage see Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 114–15.

[158] Holleman argues for a heavenly resurrection but his arguments are not all convincing; *Resurrection*, 148. Van Henten follows a similar track; *Maccabean Martyrs*, 181, n. 250. In his view, it is "only a guess" that the resurrection would take place in paradise. Yet his own conclusion, "one could think of heaven, because the Lord is often located in heaven in 2 Maccabees" (pp. 180–81), also remains a guess. The writing is not explicit on the matter. Bodily resurrection seems to fit better with the idea of an earthly paradise; what are bodies needed for in heaven? On the other hand, it is worth noting that bodily and spiritual resurrection were not envi-

Fourth Maccabees, written perhaps two centuries after 2 Maccabees,[159] retells the stories of the Maccabean martyrs. Its writer used 2 Macc as a source but remains suspiciously silent about bodily resurrection.[160] This silence is most probably intentional:[161] even though the resurrection of the body is nowhere explicitly denied, the writer clearly understands posthumous vindication in spiritual terms and envisions the vindication of the martyrs as the immortality of the soul (4 Macc 9:22; 14:5–6; 16:13; 17:12). The souls of the righteous live on after death with the patriarchs near the Lord (4 Macc 7:19; 9:8; 13:17; 16:25; 17:18–19). This vindication takes place immediately after death (4 Macc 17:17–19).[162] Thus, the writer implies a heavenly paradise where the patriarchs and other formerly dead righteous are ready to receive the martyrs at their deaths. The wicked deserve punishment, which is everlasting torment by fire (4 Macc 9:9, 30–32; 10:11; 11:3; 12:12; 13:15).

A similar basic division between the fate of the righteous and that of the wicked occurs in the writings of Philo (ca. 10 B.C.E.—45 C.E.) and Josephus (ca. 37–100 C.E.).[163] Both write in a Hellenistic Jewish environment, both treat eschatological questions, both share some similar ideas, but they also differ from each other in many respects.[164] Philo's views are closely related to his Platonic understanding of the immortal soul[165] that is imprisoned in the body (*Leg.* 1,108; 3,161; *Spec.* 4,188). At death, the soul and the body are separated

sioned in easily discernible ways. Even bodiless souls were depicted with physical qualities; see the discussion below, chap. 11.5.

[159] For the dating of each document, see van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 50–56, 73–81.

[160] Surprisingly, in 4 Macc 18:17 there is a quotation from Ezek 37:3 "Shall these dry bones live?" which, according to van Henten, implies a concept of bodily resurrection; *Maccabean Martyrs*, 184, 298. This seems unlikely. Cavallin is probably right in suspecting that the circles behind 4 Macc read Ezek 37:1–14 in a symbolic way; *Life after Death*, 122–23. It is also possible that the passage 18:6–19 is an interpolation; Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 125–26 n. 32.

[161] This impression is hard to avoid when the descriptions of the deaths of the seven brothers are compared; see, e.g., 2 Macc 7:10–11 and 4 Macc 10:17–21.

[162] The present tense used in 16:25 (ζῶσιν) implies that the patriarchs already live an eternal life with God; Cavallin, *Life After Death*, 116–17.

[163] For a convenient introduction to the writers, their works and their situation, see Attridge, "Josephus and His Works" and Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria."

[164] On both authors and the similarities and differences of their position, see Grabbe, "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus," especially 182–84.

[165] Like Plato, Philo also makes a distinction between the rational and the irrational soul. Only the former is immortal. Grabbe, "Eschatology," 166–67.

and only the soul continues its existence (*Leg.* 1,105; cf. 2,77).[166] The division between the good and the wicked is evident, for example, in *De posteriate* 39: "Death with the pious is preferable to life with the impious, for immortal life awaits those who die in this way, but eternal death those who live in that way." Those who have revered God in their lives and obeyed his will are rewarded with immortality[167] while the destiny of the ungodly is eternal death.[168]

Josephus shares many of these views:[169] the soul is separated from the body at death and continues living; the good souls are rewarded and the wicked are punished. Josephus, however, seems to believe in the resurrection of the righteous: "But the souls that remain pure and obedient obtain the most holy heavenly place. Thereafter, in the revolution of the ages, they settle anew in chaste bodies." Even though the formulation seems to imply that Josephus believed in transmigration of the souls,[170] this is not necessarily so. The passage might simply refer to a resurrection body.[171] Even if Josephus had intended transmigration, it is impossible to say whether that is only modeled to suit his Roman audience.

## 7.3. Divergent Beliefs within First Century Judaism

Josephus is also our most important source for the contemporary beliefs in the afterlife in the first century.[172] However, his descriptions of the beliefs of the different Jewish "schools" must be read

[166] According to Puech, bodily resurrection would mean chastisement to Philo; *Croyance*, 165.

[167] Cf. *Opif.* 154.

[168] The fate of the wicked is far from explicit in Philo. He uses the traditional concepts of Hades and Tartarus (*Congr.* 57; *QE* 2,40) but the usage, at least in the former passage, is purely metaphorical. On the other hand, in *Praem.* 69 he declares that, according to divine justice, death is only the beginning of punishment. See Grabbe, "Eschatology," 168–69; Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 136–37.

[169] The most significant passage in this respect is *B.J.* 3,8,5 (372–75), Josephus' speech at Jotapata. The context of the passage reveals that it is an invention of Josephus and is thus likely to reflect his own view of the soul and its destiny; Grabbe, "Eschatology," 175.

[170] Thus Grabbe, "Eschatology," 176–77.

[171] Jeremias, "ᾅδης," 147; Puech, *Croyance*, 215.

[172] *B.J.* 2,8,11.14 (154–58, 162–65); *A.J.* 18,1,3–5 (12–22). See the treatment of the passages in Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 141–47; Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.*, 299–301, Puech, *Croyance*, 208–209, 213–15 and the long discussion concerning Josephus' view of the Essenes in 705–62.

critically. First, he is clearly partial in his treatment. Second, his descriptions are probably overly Hellenistic in treatment—no doubt to make his account more acceptable for his Roman audience. Third, it is questionable whether the ideas of any of the groups he describes can be made into a single whole.

According to Josephus, the Sadducees did not believe in Fate or Providence and maintained that people had the free will to choose between good and evil. Moreover, "as for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, they will have none of them" (*B.J.* 2,8,14 [165]).[173] The New Testament conveys a similar impression. According to Luke, "the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, or angel, or spirit" (Acts 23:8).[174] In this respect, the Sadducees differed from the Pharisees and the Qumran community, who took life after death for granted yet perceived it quite differently.

Does this mean that the Sadducees denied every kind of post-mortem existence? According to Josephus' testimony, the Sadducees believed that the soul extinguishes together with the body. This would make them a Jewish counterpart to the Epicureans. It is, of course, possible that among the Sadducees or other upper-class Jews there were some who had adopted the idea of the soul's extension from Hellenistic philosophy but it is not certain whether such a belief was common among them. They could have just as well clung to the traditional view of Sheol as attested in the Torah.[175] Josephus may have made them more Epicurean than they actually were.

The opposite of the Sadducees in both Josephus' and Luke's description are the Pharisees. In the words of Josephus, the Pharisees believed that "every soul is imperishable but only the soul of the good passes into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment" (*B.J.* 2,8,14 [162–63]).[176] Again, Josephus'

[173] Cf. *A.J.* 18,1,4 (16): "The Sadducees hold that the soul perishes along with the body."

[174] Cf. Mk 12:18–27; Mt 22:23–33; Lk 20:27–38.

[175] Similarly, Puech, *Croyance*, 208–209. Cf. the view of McDonnell & Lang who offer a strangely blurred view; *Heaven*, 19–20. According to them, the Sadducees continued the tradition of the "Yahweh-alonists," i.e., the traditional view of a shadowy existence in Sheol. Yet they believed that the soul perishes at death. These two views are not the same, however. The Epicureans, who taught the extinction of the soul denied all forms of afterlife, also the traditional Homeric view.

[176] Cf. *A.J.* 18,1,3 (14): "Their belief is that souls have power to survive death and that there are rewards and punishments under the earth for those who have

testimony should not be taken at face-value. The belief of the Pharisees sounds suspiciously the same as Josephus' own view[177] which makes it impossible to say whether this represents the majority Pharisaic view or merely Josephus' own belief which he calls Pharisaic. The expressions Josephus uses to describe the fate of the good soul, "to pass into another body" and "an easy return to life," also resemble Josephus' own belief that the good souls "settle anew in chaste bodies." If Josephus intends metempsychosis here, his description hardly does justice to the Pharisees who certainly did not teach transmigration.[178] Whatever the intention of Josephus, his Roman audience probably understood his words in the familiar terms of metempsychosis.[179]

The third view Josephus describes is that of the Essenes:

> They believe that the bodies are corruptible and their matter impermanent, but that the souls persevere. Coming from the finest ether the souls become entangled in the bodies, as in prison, drawn down by some natural spell. When once they leave the bonds of the flesh, just as if released from a long slavery, then they rejoice and are lifted high in the air. Agreeing with the sons of Greece, they declare that for the good souls there is reserved an abode beyond the ocean, a place which is oppressed neither by storms nor snowfalls nor burning heat but is refreshed by the ever gentle west wind blowing from the ocean; but they banish the wicked souls to a gloomy and stormy dungeon, full of never-ending punishments (*B.J.* 2,8,11 [154–55]).[180]

This description must also be studied critically since Josephus' report is thoroughly hellenized, as he himself admits (". . . agreeing with the sons of Greece . . .").[181] The description of the abode of the good souls especially bears great resemblance to the description of the Isles of the Blessed, as Josephus himself notes a little further in the same context. From the earliest Greek accounts onwards, the Isles of the Blessed were situated beyond the ocean and characterized by a gentle climate.[182] The description of the "gloomy dungeon" closely recalls

devoted their life to virtue or vice: for the latter eternal imprisonment is set, for the former an easy return to life."

[177] Grabbe, "Eschatology," 176–77. Cf. *B.J.* 3,8,5 quoted above p. 148.

[178] The term Josephus uses in *A.J.* 18,1,3 is ἀναβιώσις. It occurs also in 2 Macc 7:9 where it certainly denotes resurrection life, not metempsychosis.

[179] Cf. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 168; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1302; Segal, *Life after Death*, 381.

[180] Cf. *A.J.* 18,1,5 (18).

[181] Cf. Segal, *Life after Death*, 298–99.

[182] Homer *Od.* 4,566–68; Hesiod *Op.* 170–72; Pindar *Ol.* 2,71–74; Lucian *Ver. hist.* 2,5.

that of the Hesiodian Tartarus.[183] It is credible that the Essenes did envision different fates for the good and the wicked, as attested in several Qumran writings,[184] but it is doubtful whether they would have presented their ideas this way. Another problem has to do with the question of resurrection. According to Hippolytus, the Essenes believed in bodily resurrection, a concept absent from Josephus' account.[185] Most scholars give priority to Josephus since Hippolytus wrote about a century later, probably used either Josephus or a common source, and may have added the idea of resurrection to promote the Christian doctrine,[186] but the matter is disputed.[187] It is, of course, also possible that the Essenes held different ideas, either maintaining contradictory views or disagreeing among themselves on the right view.[188]

It is likely that both the description of Josephus and that of Hippolytus are modeled according to the respective author's purpose. The Qumran documents seem to indicate that at least the Qumran community did not primarily formulate their beliefs either in the terms of the immortality of the soul or that of bodily resurrection.[189] What is characteristic of such documents as the *Community Rule*, the *War Rule*, and especially the *Hodayot*, is the belief in realized eschatology: the members of the community already participate

---

[183] Cf. Hesiod *Theog.* 119.

[184] See an example in n. 190 below.

[185] According to *Haer.* 9,27:

> The doctrine of resurrection is also strong among them. For they agree that the flesh will also rise and that it will be immortal, in the same manner as the soul is already immortal. When it is separated from the body it is now to rest in one airy and bright place until the judgment. When the Greeks heard of this place they called it "the island of the blessed."

[186] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 167–69; Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 70; Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 114–15. The latter remarks that, despite this, Hippolytus may have preserved some authentic details such as the conflagration of the universe, which has a counterpart in 1QH 11:29–36 (the numbering of the *Hodayot* follows here and elsewhere Puech's reconstruction of the scroll in "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1 QH)," 43–53.)

[187] The opposite is argued, e.g., by Black, "The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus," 175 and more recently Puech, *Croyance*, 703–69 and Segal, *Life after Death*, 300–301. They suggest that Josephus' audience would have found the idea of resurrection repulsive and so he left it out deliberately.

[188] Riley, *Resurrection*, 19.

[189] I follow the most widely supported view in scholarship, i.e., that the Qumran community represents one branch of the larger Essene movement. For the identification of the community as Essene, see Vanderkam & Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*, 239–54.

in eternal, angelic life.[190] This life will continue unbroken despite death.[191] Thus, the Qumran community transferred the reward of the righteous, which earlier writings such as Daniel and *1 Enoch* reserved for the future life, to begin already in this life.[192]

The Qumran writings, however, are far from being unambiguous about questions concerning the afterlife. The question of belief in resurrection is especially difficult to answer.[193] The scrolls, not all of which were produced by the Qumran community, do not provide a clear and consistent view of the matter.[194] The possible references to resurrection are so few and vague that it is fairly safe to assume that belief in resurrection did not play a prominent role in the eschatological hopes of the community. Yet such belief was not alien to the community, either—as attested by the fact that writings promoting the idea of resurrection, such as Daniel, *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, were known and read in the Qumran community. The main emphasis in the community's eschatology seems to have been on the present participation of the eternal life. As the community seems to have expected the great eschatological event to happen during its own time, the final consummation would entail resurrection only for those members of the community who had already died.[195] On the other hand, resurrection is not the only means by which the communion between angels and the deceased have been imagined to take place. The scrolls do not give a definite answer to the question. What is clear is the basic division: the righteous are rewarded

[190] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 144–69; Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 117–23. According to Puech, the glory of the angels is only anticipated by the community; *Croyance*, 425. Many of the Qumran texts, however, more probably indicate that the communion with angels has already begun. An example of this is 1QH 11:19–23:

> I thank you, Lord, because you saved my life from the pit, and from Sheol and Abaddon you have lifted me up to an everlasting height, so that I can walk on a boundless plain. And I know that there is hope for someone you fashioned out of clay for an everlasting community. The corrupt spirit you have purified from the great sin so that he can take his place with the host of the holy ones, and can enter in communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven (trans. in García Martínez, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 332).

This does not exclude the idea that the full glory is to be realized in the future.

[191] The view comes very close to that expressed in Wis 1–5, cf. above.

[192] Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 119.

[193] Puech argues for a strong resurrection belief in Qumran; *Croyance*, 792–802, but has been rightly criticized by others; see Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 115–28; Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 43–47.

[194] P. Davies, "Death," 202.

[195] P. Davies, "Death," 207–209.

and will participate in eternal life, the wicked are punished and destroyed.[196]

By the first century, then, there was a variety of different beliefs concerning life after death.[197] Belief in some form of resurrection was widespread.[198] Sometimes the resurrection was envisioned in physical terms[199] but this seems to have been less common than often assumed.[200] In most sources, the form of resurrection remains unclear.[201] Some sources attest a general resurrection, others seem to limit it to either only the very righteous or both to the very righteous and the very wicked. As has become evident, life after death and the vindication of the righteous was also envisaged by using other concepts such as immortality, incorruption, or using angelic or astral images.[202] The time of the eschatological vindication and retribution also varies.

---

196 Cf. 1QS 4:6–14; 11:7–8; CD 2:3–10; 1QM 12:1–5; 14:4–5; 1QH 7:21–24; 14:29–34; 19:10–14.

197 See the discussion in Segal, *Life after Death*, 351–87.

198 Collins, *Daniel*, 398.

199 The clearest early example of bodily resurrection is in 2 Macc 7. Bodily resurrection is also attested in 4 Ezra and *2 Bar.* but in these writings resurrection is not a vindication of the righteous (as in 2 Macc) but a necessary precondition for judgment. The real reward (or punishment) takes place after the judgment. An interesting source for bodily resurrection is a fragment from the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, written before 1 Clem., which uses it as a source, but preserved only in later writings (*bSanh.* 91a–b; cf. Epiphanius *Pan.* 64,70,5–17). It relates a parable of a blind man and a lame man who steal fruit from a king's orchard by cunning. The lame man climbs onto the shoulders of the blind man and so they succeed in their theft. According to the moral of the story, body and soul, like the blind man and the lame man, cooperate in unjust deeds. That is why both must be judged.

200 Cf. Holleman who states: "the Jewish expectation of the bodily resurrection at the end of time is just one of the many views on life after death which was current in first century C.E. Judaism" (*Resurrection*, 85). In older scholarship, a sharp distinction was drawn between the Hebrew concept of a bodily resurrection and the Greek concept of immortality of the soul but this is a gross oversimplification, as shown, e.g., by Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 177–80; cf. Cavallin, *Life after Death*, 15–16. However, the distinction also occurs here and there in more recent literature, see, e.g., the additional note in Ellis, "La fonction de l'eschatologie dans l'évangile de Luc" from 1989.

201 In most writings, it is not clear whether it is the body or only the spirit that is resurrected, that is, raised from the underworld to an upper realm, either on earth or in heaven. Not all texts speak of resurrection at all, only of some indefinite form of eternal life. See, e.g., *1 En.* 103:4; *Jub.* 23:6; *Ps. Sol.* 3:12; 13:11; 14:3.10; *Sib. Or.* 3,702–31.767–95.

202 The righteous are compared to stars or other heavenly luminaries in *1 En.* 104:2 cf. 92:4; 58:3–6; 4 Ezra 7:97,125; *2 Bar.* 51:3; 4 Macc 17:5; *T. Mos.* 10:9–10 and in Philo *Gig.* 8. Cf. Hengel, *Judaism*, 358. In Jewish writings, the stars are often equated with the host of heaven, e.g., *1 En.* 39:5–7; cf. the Greek idea of stars being deities, above p. 68.

Some sources connect it with the final end of history; others anticipate an immediate eschatological consummation at the death of each individual. Yet others combine both views and envision an intermediate state between the preliminary rewards and punishments straight after death and the final judgment at the end of time. Moreover, despite the rise of apocalyptic eschatology, the traditional view of death and Sheol is still maintained.[203]

This diversity appears not only between different groups and circles but also within them.[204] Various beliefs even occur within one writing. This is not only a feature of such composite works as *1 Enoch*, but hardly any writing gives a clear and coherent picture of postmortem fate.[205] It is worth noting that ideas that to a present-day analytical reader seem contradictory were not necessarily thought of as mutually exclusive. The variety of different beliefs is also reflected in Jewish epitaphs. Some, but very few, express belief in bodily resurrection, in others astral or some other form of immortality is expected.[206] The majority remain silent on life after death. However, the evidence, both epigraphic and literary, is too scanty and ambiguous to allow any precise assessments concerning the popularity of different views.

---

[203] This is evident from, e.g., the books of Tobit (Tob 3:6; 4:5–9) and Ben Sira (Sir 17:27–28); cf. Nickelsburg, "Judgment," 144–46. In addition to these, Cavallin lists writings which, in his words, are "silent on after-life" (including those that express the traditional view): Jdt, *Let. Aris.*, Bar, 1 Macc, 3 Macc, 3 Ezra (= the deuterocanonical writing entitled 1 Esdras [a] in the LXX), 4 *Bar* (*Paraleipomena Jeremia*), *As. Mos.* and *Mart. Isa*; *Life after Death*, 193. Of these, however, *As. Mos.* does seem to indicate rewards and punishments after death; see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 29–31.

[204] Riley, *Resurrection*, 22.

[205] For example, *Apoc. Mos.* envisages a general resurrection on the last day when the holy people will enjoy the joys of paradise (13:3–5; cf. 41:3), yet Adam's soul is taken to the heavenly paradise immediately after death (37:3–5). Van Henten argues that 4 Macc includes both the image of soul's immortality (18:23), astral immortality (17:5) and bodily resurrection (18:17); *Maccabean Martyrs*, 183–84. However, the first two images may both refer to celestial immortality and it is doubtful whether the last passage really refers to bodily resurrection; see above, n. 160 on p. 147 above.

[206] Van der Horst, *Ancient*, 123–26.

CHAPTER EIGHT

# SUMMARY OF PART TWO

Belief in differentiated fates after death, bliss for the good and punishment for the wicked, was commonly held in Hellenistic and Roman times, as attested in several sources, both pagan and Jewish. This kind of division among the dead also forms the basic core of the afterlife in Luke's story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. In this respect, the Lukan afterlife scene fits well his overall Hellenistic cultural environment. However, there is no need to try to seek particular parallels, whether literary or oral, for Luke's account. The whole idea of fixed stories that circulated unaltered, on which later stories were dependent, is not convincing in the light of recent orality studies. Instead of fixed parallels, we should speak of the intertextual web of common motifs, images and themes.

The survey of Greco-Roman sources shows that ideas concerning the afterlife were varied. The earliest evidence, the Homeric epics, depicts an undifferentiated death: everybody dies and shares the equal fate of a shadowy life in Hades. However, alongside this common fate, there are also rudiments of a more personal afterlife for the dead. In later sources, the idea of a personal afterlife becomes stronger, especially from the fifth century B.C.E. onwards. However, this change is not an abrupt, foreign invasion into Greek thinking but reflects a gradual shift in collective attitudes towards death. Moreover, the undifferentiated understanding of death does not disappear but exists side by side with the more individual ideas even in Hellenistic and Roman times.

The individual treatment of the dead appears in many different forms but common to all of them is the idea of differentiation: some receive a better lot than others. The division is sometimes envisioned as being based on the basis of initiation (the initiates will be blessed, the uninitiated will suffer), but more frequently on moral grounds. Those who have lived a virtuous life will be rewarded while the wicked will face punishment after death. Sometimes the concept of the otherworldly judgment is connected with the idea of metempsychosis (e.g., Pindar, Plato). The blessed abode of the good souls is

sometimes envisioned as a part of the subterranean world of the dead but more and more often the blessed dead are pictured as joining the immortal gods, or becoming stars, or their fate is described with using some other celestial image.

The gradual shift in the collective beliefs becomes apparent when the descriptions of Homer and Plato are juxtaposed. The shadowy, passive existence of the Homeric netherworld has become active partaking in rewards and punishments whose intensity is due to behavior in earthly life. This change has often been associated with "Orphic influence." However, the concept of "Orphic eschatology" is dependent on an outdated picture of a specific Orphic movement. The eschatological beliefs that are often labeled Orphic in later sources seem to have originated with the mysteries. To call the famous gold leaves "Orphic," is quite misleading; the leaves themselves reveal connections to Bacchic rituals.

Diversity of beliefs, different views even within the writings of a single author, is characteristic of ideas on the afterlife in the Hellenistic and Roman times. The Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul is reflected in many treatments of the soul's fate after death. Both poets, such as Virgil, and philosophers, such as Cicero and Plutarch, use Platonic concepts and images in their descriptions. Boundaries between different Hellenistic philosophical schools, however, remain ambiguous. Additionally, some later Stoic writers may combine a Platonic view of the immortal soul with the Stoic idea of conflagration. On the other hand, many Platonic accounts are "Stoicized." Many philosophers combined the soul's fate after death with their cosmological frame. For example, for Plutarch, the realm of Hades is situated somewhere between the earth and the moon. The immortal soul was of divine origin and at death it returned to its celestial home with the gods. Not all Hellenistic philosophers believed in the immortality of the soul, though. The Epicureans, most notably, refuted any kind of postmortem existence of the soul.

The Epicurean type of nihilism is also reflected in some epitaphs. This, together with the fact that most epitaphs are silent concerning fate after death and that literary treatments of the theme are deemed as philosophical speculations, has led to the claim that the popular attitude towards life after death was indifferent. Accordingly, the most common view concerning the afterlife was the traditional Homeric concept of Hades. A careful study of both the epigraphic and the literary evidence shows, however, that such a scholarly view

is one-sided and misleading. The most important function of the epitaphs was to commemorate the deceased and, for this reason, the funerary inscriptions concentrate on earthly life, not on what lies beyond death. Moreover, those epitaphs that speak of life after death are highly formulaic, often based on widely circulated models. The funerary inscriptions tend to be conservative and repeat traditional metaphors. This is seen, for example, in many Christian epitaphs that still use traditional pagan expressions.

Thus, the epitaphs do not reveal much of the expectations of ordinary people. The literary sources point to the conclusion that belief in differentiated fates after death was more commonly held than often presumed. Not only do the members of the literate elite scorn the common people for excessive fear of otherworldly punishments but many eschatological myths and other literary accounts also reflect popular beliefs. Literature also shows that using traditional Homeric language does not necessarily denote Homeric thinking but belief in rewards and punishments after death is easily combined with traditional concepts.

A diversity of views also occurs in Jewish sources. Most of the Hebrew Bible depict Sheol, the abode of the dead, in terms corresponding to the Homeric Hades. Sheol is a gloomy and sad place, void of life and the presence of Yahweh. Gradually, however, Yahweh's power was thought to extend beyond the limits of death. One way of envisioning the continuing existence with Yahweh was resurrection. This belief appears only on the fringes of the Hebrew Bible, unambiguously only in the book of Daniel. However, it is not possible with the Jewish sources either to discern any linear "development" from undifferentiated views to differentiated ones. The origins of newer concepts are often obscure and older concepts occur side by side with the newer ones well into Hellenistic and Roman times.

The belief in a personal afterlife becomes a salient feature of apocalyptic eschatology. The very idea of the possibility of transcending death is the most distinct marker between apocalyptic and prophetic eschatology, even though the boundaries between these two categories are not clear-cut. Instead of a sharp polarity, "apocalyptic" and "prophetic" should be understood as being on the same continuum. The earliest source for an apocalyptic differentiation of postmortem fates is in the Book of the Watchers, in *1 Enoch* 22. There the souls of the dead are separated from each other according to their righteousness and sinfulness. In this early description, the dead

are apparently divided into four groups but in later accounts, such as 4 Ezra, *2 Baruch*, and the *Testament of Abraham*, the division into two becomes settled.

Ideas of postmortem rewards and punishments are not restricted only to apocalypses but occur in many other literary genres as well, in testaments (most notably the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*) and historical writings (2 Maccabees, Josephus), in sapiential and philosophical treatises (Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Maccabees, Philo). All these envision a postmortem judgment that is based on (dis)obedience to God and his law. The forms of retribution and vindication are depicted differently. Some accounts expect a bodily resurrection; the clearest case is 2 Maccabees. However, the form of resurrection is not explicit in most writings. For example, Daniel 12 and *1 Enoch* 22 state that the righteous dead will be raised but it remains unclear whether this is a bodily resurrection or whether it is only the souls that are raised from beneath the earth. Especially in the former case, there seems to be little room for a bodily afterlife; the righteous will shine like the stars, the equivalent to Greek astral immortality. In some texts, such as 4 Ezra and *2 Baruch*, the souls of the righteous dead wait in chambers (and the wicked souls wander around) until the resurrection and judgment. The ultimate fate, however, is transformation into angelic state, which makes the interim bodily resurrection quite superfluous. In other accounts, an example of which is the *Testament of Abraham*, the judgment takes place immediately after the death of each individual. Others, such as the Wisdom of Solomon and many Qumranic writings, promote realized eschatology. Eternal life and death are present realities; the life of the righteous will continue beyond death while the wicked are already dead. The writings of Josephus attest to several different beliefs within Judaism that he associates with different Jewish "schools." According to him, the Pharisees and the Essenes believed in a personal afterlife, albeit in somewhat different terms, while the Sadducees clung to the traditional undiffernetiated view of Sheol.

A common denominator between these divergent ideas, the traditional view excluded, is division between the dead. Different fates await those usually described as righteous and wicked. The former are rewarded and exalted, the latter punished or destroyed. The different fates of the rich man in Hades and Lazarus in Abraham's

bosom fit this picture seamlessly. A corresponding differentiation was commonplace in both contemporary Greek and Jewish writings. It seems not to have been a peculiarity shared by only some idiosyncratic groups but, as far as we can infer from the available sources, a deeply-rooted belief in the mental environment of the Mediterranean world.

PART III

# LUKE'S DESCRIPTION OF THE HEREAFTER IN CONTEXT

CHAPTER NINE

# PRELIMINARY REMARKS: THE FUNCTION OF THE AFTERLIFE SCENE

The discussion in Part II showed that division of souls after death is a concept deeply rooted in Luke's cultural environment. Most often this division is made on moral grounds; the virtuous receive the good lot, the wicked the bad lot. In Jewish sources, the distinction is usually made between those who are obedient to God and his law and those who are not. Most often, the latter group consists of non-Israelites who oppress and scorn God's own people.

What does Luke envision as the reason for the different otherworldly fates? Before proceeding to the analysis of the different features in Luke's account, it is worth asking how Luke uses the device of dividing the dead. This includes two aspects. First, why do the fates change? The rich man is not characterized as especially wicked or Lazarus as especially pious. Is wealth/poverty an adequate reason for the reversal? Second, what is the reason for the otherworldly scene? In other words, what is the moral of the story and how does the description of postmortem fate function as part of it?

Most commentators deny that wealth and poverty alone suffice for the reversal. In their view, the otherworldly fate indicates that the rich man must be godless and Lazarus pious, even though this is not explicitly stated.[1] This is why the different extra-biblical parallels—most notably the Gressmann hypothesis—have been seen as crucial for determining the reason for the reversal.[2] Different details of Luke's story have also been read as if to reveal the ungodliness of the rich man and the piety of Lazarus. For example, according to Karl Bornhäuser, the audience could have easily inferred the true character of the men from the depiction of their lifestyle. The daily

---

[1] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 636; Plummer, *S. Luke*, 390; Marshall, *Luke*, 63; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1132.

[2] Cf. Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 182; Grobel, ". . . Whose Name," 374; and many others referred to in p. 18, n. 35. Despite his fierce criticism of those who advocate the Gressmann hypothesis, Hock shares the basic stance of finding a reason for the reversal from extra-biblical parallel stories; "Lazarus and Micyllus," 457–62.

feasting of the rich man means that he did not work even though the biblical law knows only one weekly feast, the Sabbath, while the other six are reserved for working.[3] Likewise, the phrase "longed to be satisfied . . ." reveals Lazarus' piety; he was patient and resigned himself to his meager lot.[4]

Another indicator of the poor man's assumed piety is seen in his name The name Λάζαρος is a Greek version of the Hebrew name לַעְזָר, a Rabbinic derivation of the name אֶלְעָזָר with the meaning "he whom God helps."[5] Thus, the name implies that the poor man put his trust in God alone. However, we have no proof that Luke knew Hebrew and even if he did, his Greek-speaking audience would certainly not have known any. Therefore, if the etymology of the name were important, it would have been explained explicitly (as Luke does elsewhere, e.g., in Acts 4:36; 13:8).[6]

Recently, many scholars have advocated another view. According to them, what is striking in the story is its lack of any moralism.[7] This is strongly emphasized by Richard Bauckham.[8] According to him, the reversal merely compensates for the earthly inequality and injustice. The rich man has already received the good life has to offer and now it is his turn to suffer. Likewise Lazarus who has suffered enough is now consoled. Bauckham concludes:

> For this view of the matter, it is not relevant to condemn the rich man for over-indulgence, dishonesty or even neglecting his duty of charity to the poor (if that means he should have relieved Lazarus' suffering while remaining rich himself). What is wrong with the situation in this world, according to the parable, is the stark inequality in the living conditions of the two men.[9]

---

[3] Bornhäuser, "Zum Verständnis der Geschichte vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus Luk. 16,19–31," 834–35.
[4] Bornhäuser, "Verständnis," 838.
[5] Strack & Billerbeck, *Kommentar 2*, 223.
[6] Cf. Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 454. For this reason, it is unlikely that the name Lazarus was meant to be the interpretative key to the meaning of the story the way Cave ("Lazarus and Lukan Deuteronomy," 323–25) and Sahlin ("Lasarus-gestalten," 168–70) suggest; see above, p. 31, n. 96.
[7] This is often combined with the deeply-rooted conviction concerning the disunity of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Thus it is a commonplace to point out that the first part of the story lacks all moral grounds for the reversal; see Evans, *Saint Luke* 612; Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*, 142–43.
[8] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 103–105.
[9] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 104.

Bauckham is to be credited for his critique of the oftentimes forced attempts to find suitable explanations for the reversal, but his own interpretation is unconvincing.[10] What Bauckham fails to see is that the latter part of the story clearly indicates the fault of the rich man. He did not listen to "Moses and the prophets," the guides to proper behavior, that is, to the right use of one's possessions and providing for the poor.[11] The earthly conduct of the rich man is in striking contrast, e.g., to "the fast God has chosen," proclaimed by Isaiah, which is to ". . . share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked, to cover them, and not to hide yourself from your own kin" (Isa 58:7). The rich man does the opposite: he is full while the beggar stays hungry, he does not let the beggar at his gate into his house, and does not cover the sores of the poor man.[12]

Thus, the story makes it clear that the rich man is a negative figure who stays unrepentant. The poor man, on the other hand, represents the needy who are objects of God's special protection.[13] All through the gospel, the Lukan Jesus promises eschatological rewards for the poor; the coming of the Kingdom and the ἔσχατον bring relief to them.[14] According to Luke, Jesus begins his public

[10] Cf. the critique by Green (*The Gospel of Luke* 604–605, n. 326):

> The importance of the Lukan co-text to the meaning of this parable is underscored by the sometimes quite different interpretations offered by investigations that adopt a tradition-historical approach. For example Bauckham ("Rich Man and Lazarus") insists that the story assumes neither that Lazarus was pious (and so did not "deserve" his heavenly reward) nor that the wealthy man was wicked (and so did not "deserve" his judgment). In the Lukan co-text, Lazarus is not portrayed as pious, but the rich man is condemned for not taking seriously his scriptural responsibility to use his wealth on behalf of the needy.

[11] This is the more surprising since Bauckham otherwise strongly insists the unity of the story.

[12] Bornhäuser, "Verständnis," 834–37; Seccombe, *Possessions*, 176. It is clear that the rich man disregards "Moses and the prophets," and fails to share his bread, invite the poor, and cover the naked but there is no equivalent in the story to the last exhortation, "do not hide yourself from your own kin." Both Bornhäuser and Seccombe assume this since both the rich man and Lazarus call on Abraham as father. This, however, is not stated. The poor man does not call on anyone, he simply is in the "bosom of Abraham."

[13] According to a common scholarly opinion, Luke shows a special interest and sympathy for the poor and other marginal people in the society; Bammel, "πτωχός," 904–907; Dupont, *Beatitudes 1*, 325; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 103; Seccombe, *Possessions*, 11–12. This view has also been contested but see Esler's critique against such criticism; *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, 165.

[14] Cf. Hiers, "Friends," 34: "There can be little doubt that Jesus—according to

career by proclaiming to have come "to bring good news to the poor" (Lk 4:18).[15] This inaugural sermon in Nazareth (Lk 4:16–30) is commonly considered as Luke's programmatic manifesto,[16] closely connected with his salvation historical scheme.[17] The eschatological promise becomes explicit in the beatitudes where Jesus addresses the poor together with the hungry and the bereaved (Lk 6:20–21). Moreover, the poor and the disabled are the first to be invited to the messianic banquet in the subsequent parable of the Great Supper (Lk 14:21).[18] This is why the rich must distribute their possessions to the poor and take care of them (Lk 14:13; 18:22; 19:8). The same ethos is also reflected in the Rich Man and Lazarus. The rich man does not use his worldly goods as he should have and thus receives his punishment. The poor man does not need to be especially pious; since he is poor and has no one else to help him, God takes care of him.

The reversal of fates contains a powerful rhetorical overtone: the reversal is permanent and cannot be undone. The fate after death is closely related to life on earth. After death, it is too late to try to change things.[19] Abraham's words (vv. 25–26) are not intended to instruct the rich man, who can no longer affect his fate, but to warn those in danger of making the same mistake.[20] "Moses and the prophets" guide people to correct behavior, that is, to repent and thus to gain salvation.[21] This kind of emphasis on Jewish law and its continuing validity has sometimes troubled scholars. Vincent Tanghe, for one, claims that listening to Moses and the prophets can hardly be sufficient for Luke who has previously reported that the disciples must listen to Jesus (in the transfiguration story;

Luke—expected that the Kingdom of God would be populated primarily, if not exclusively, by the poor."

[15] Cf. 7:22. Luke seems to understand the term "poor" both in a symbolic and a literal sense; see Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 181; York, *Last Shall Be First*, 100; Seccombe, *Posessions*, 27.

[16] Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 164; Siker, "First to the Gentiles: A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16–30", 75; J.T. Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 165.

[17] Hill, "The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke 4,16–30)," 178.

[18] Compare the Matthean parallel (22:10) where poverty and physical disabilities are not mentioned; instead the servants invite both bad and good people.

[19] Cf. Glombitza, "Reiche Mann," 172–74.

[20] Seccombe, *Possessions*, 177.

[21] More on the interrelationship between repentance and salvation in chap. 14.1.

Lk 9:34).[22] In Luke's view, however, listening to Moses and the prophets and listening to Jesus are not mutually exclusive. The law points to Christ, and true obedience to the law is in accordance to listening to Jesus. The validity of the law is important for Luke in his endeavor to legitimate the Christian claim of being God's people.[23] Luke knows only one covenant: the Church has inherited the promises once given to Israel.[24] That is why it is important for Luke to show that there is an unbroken continuum from the Jewish covenant to Christianity. This also explains why the Lukan Jesus directs his mission only to the Jews. It is only after Jesus' earthly life that the Gentiles became members of the covenant.[25]

In Luke's salvation historical scheme, obeying the law is essential before Jesus' time. Being law-abiding and devout Jews (like Luke depicts the parents of Jesus) equals being a Christian, which is not yet possible.[26] After the resurrection, keeping the law and repentance become connected with faith in Christ. Obeying the Scriptures makes the righteous Jews understand that they need something besides the law: they must believe in Jesus. On the other hand, the hypocritical Jews do not understand this and thus, their obeying the law is no true observance.[27]

---

[22] Tanghe, "Abraham, son fils at son envoyé (Luc 16,19–31)," 572–73. Tanghe solves the presumed contradiction by assuming that Luke uses here an argument *ad hominem* to convince the Jewish audience with Jewish argumentation. The exhortation to listen to Moses and the prophets is ironical: "If you claim that it is sufficient to listen to Moses and the prophets, then that is sufficient for you and there is no need to send Lazarus."

[23] Esler, *Community and the Gospel*, 113–14; Syreeni, "Matthew, Luke and the Law," 146–50.

[24] Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*, 144; Salo, *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation*, 29–31,63. Cf. Lk 1:72; Acts 3:25, 7:8. The expression "new covenant" occurs only once in Luke's double work (Lk 22:20) and the authenticity of the verse has been rightly questioned. Verses 19b–20, including the words "this cup is a new covenant in my blood that is poured out for you," are probably an interpolation. See Ehrmann, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, 198–209.

[25] And even then, the first Gentiles to convert are as close to being Jews as possible; the first Gentile convert in Acts is the centurion Cornelius who is depicted as "a devout man who feared God with all his household; he gave alms generously to the people and prayed constantly to God" (Acts 10:2). See Salo, *Treatment*, 298–304.

[26] Salo, *Treatment*, 110.

[27] Cf. Syreeni, "Matthew, Luke and Law," 147–50; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 114.

In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the rich man is a child of Abraham, i.e., a Jew.[28] According to Luke, to be a proper Jew in the time of Jesus means obeying the law, listening to Moses and the prophets, but there is even more to the treatment of the law in the story. In a Christian context, the reference to someone's resurrection from the dead (v. 31) points to Jesus and his resurrection. Thus, the words of Abraham suggest that, as the brothers of the rich man do not obey the law, they do not believe in the resurrection, either.[29] One aspect of the story is to hint that those Jews who refuse to confess Jesus, also fail to fulfill the law of Moses; by deserting Jesus, they have deserted the law.[30] In Luke's view, the Christians remain faithful to the law which the Jewish leaders have abandoned[31] and thus the law distinguishes Christians (the true Jews) from the apostate Jewish leaders.

The Pharisees in Luke's story often represent these unrepentant Jews. They are those who "trust in themselves that they are righteous" (Lk 18:9) and are in no need of repentance (Lk 15:7).[32] Even though Jesus associates with them, teaches them and dines with them, they reject Jesus.[33] However, Luke's portrayal of the Pharisees is

---

[28] Tanghe, "Abraham," 567.

[29] Tanghe, "Abraham," 577.

[30] See Lehtipuu, "Characterization and Persuasion," 103–104. Cf. J.T. Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 60. 202–203. It seems to me, however, that Sanders pictures Luke's attitude towards the Jews far too negatively, describing it, e.g., as "blanket hatred of the Jews as a group (p. 311)." In Sanders' opinion, Luke thinks that every Jew is a bad Jew and therefore makes little difference between unbelieving Jews and Jewish Christians (pp. 316–17). The polemic against the Jews in Luke-Acts may well derive from Gentile Christian identity problem, as Sanders suggests (pp. 313–14; cf. Maddox, *Purpose*, 183–85), but in my view, Luke seems to respect Jewish Christianity more than Sanders assumes. Especially the infancy narratives are saturated with Jewish piety, which Luke obviously reveres. I am tempted to agree more with those who interpret Simeon's oracle (Lk 2:34) of the "rise and fall of many in Israel" as a prophecy of the division between different Jews in their relationship to Jesus. On Sanders' position on this point, see p. 162 in his work.

[31] Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 119–21.

[32] Repentance in Luke is closely associated with salvation (see further below, pp. 247–49). Thus, the righteous who do not need to repent are not saved, either. After all, Jesus says he only came to call sinners to repentance, not the righteous (Lk 5:32). For this reason, I disagree with those scholars who argue for universal salvation in Luke-Acts. Recently, e.g., Nave maintains that, in Luke's view, God's plan for salvation is open to everyone. All that people have to do, in order to be saved, is to repent; *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*, 221. However, there are people in Luke's story who do not understand that they also need to repent. They are outsiders and will remain outsiders.

[33] Luke frequently depicts Jesus as dining in the houses of the Pharisees (7:36–50;

ambiguous. They play a double role—on one hand, they are constantly in conflict with Jesus, on the other, they act as legitimators of the Christian faith, especially in the book of Acts (e.g., Acts 5:34–39; 23:9).[34] In the gospel, Luke's treatment of the Pharisees is mostly negative. Chapter sixteen is a part of his anti-Pharisaic polemic. By a clever assimilation of terms, Luke directs the polemic against the wealthy in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus towards the Pharisees as well.[35] In v. 14, the Lukan Jesus accuses the Pharisees of being "lovers of money."[36] Luke did not necessarily envision the Pharisees as rich in economic terms, but as esteemed and accepted in the eyes of others. Moreover, they reject Jesus, and they reject the outcasts (Lk 15:1–3), just as the rich man rejects the outcast Lazarus.[37] Thus the rich man in the story is also a prototype of an unrepentant Pharisee who ignores the real intention of the law while preserving the letter (cf. v. 15; 11:42; 18:11).[38]

The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus contains several themes intertwined. It is a powerful exhortation to repent and use one's wealth properly. The warning concerning the right use of possessions also serves as an anti-Pharisaic polemic. The reversal of the fates intensifies both teachings. The one who does not give heed to Moses and the prophets will find out that it is too late to repent after death. Thus, the reversal of the otherworldly fates of the two men is an essential part of the story.

The function of the afterlife scene is to strengthen the moral exhortation. In this respect, the story is an apocalyptic story, revealing the fate of the dead and thus comparable with many apocalypses. However, the story differs from many other apocalyptic accounts (e.g. *1 En.* 22,

11:37–53; 14:1–24) but these scenes end up in a conflict. Thus, it is apparent that the Lukan Jesus means the unrepentant Pharisees when he speaks of those who will find themselves locked out from the kingdom (Lk 13:26). They complain: "We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets" but the Lord will say: "I do not know where you come from; go away from me, all you evildoers!" Cf. J.T. Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 191–92.

[34] Carroll, "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees," 611–20.

[35] Cf. Ireland, *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God: An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward*, 128–34. Ireland has keen observations concerning Luke's anti-Pharisaic argumentation in chap. 16. His overall trust in the historicity of the material, however, puts the Pharisees in a strange light. It seems obvious that chap. 16 reflects Luke's, not Jesus', view of the Pharisees.

[36] Cf. the accusations against Pharisaic hypocrisy in Lk 11:39; 20:47.

[37] Johnson, *Literary Function*, 139–43.

[38] Seccombe, *Possessions*, 179.

4 Ezra, *2 Bar., T. Ab.*),[39] as the fate of the dead is not revealed for its own sake but with the aim of moral exhortation.[40] The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus is, in this respect, analogous to the story of Er in Plato's *Republic*[41] and other stories that use an eschatological myth to promote a right way of life.[42] In the description of the otherworldly conditions of the two men, the story makes use of several images and themes familiar to its audience to underline the severity of the otherworldly retribution.

[39] See above pp. 130–32 and pp. 138–43.

[40] Naturally, a moral lesson belongs to many apocalypses, as well (e.g. *T. Ab.*). However, the primary function of many apocalyptic visions of the otherworld seems to be expressly the revelation of the fate of the dead which compensates the otherworldly sufferings of the righteous. For example, in the description of 4 Ezra, most people are condemned and await a post-mortem retribution since they are Israel's enemies. There is no question of their repenting and changing the coming verdict.

[41] See above p. 73.

[42] See the writings of Cicero, Pseudo-Plato and Plutarch pp. 87–95 above.

CHAPTER TEN

# THE STRUCTURAL THEMES OF THE STORY

The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus is built around two narrative topoi; the reversal of fates after death and the possibility of receiving a message from the world of the dead. Of these two themes, the motif of reversal has largely dominated scholarship, as noted in the survey of the previous research in chap. 2. However, the message from the world of the dead to the living is even more widely used motif in ancient story-telling. This part of the example story has received much less attention,[1] even though it also belongs to the essential structure of the story.

Luke combines these two frequently occurring themes by emphasizing the finality of the reversal. According to the story, the fate of the dead is definitive, nothing can change it. That is why no message from the world of the dead can affect those who do not live according to the will of God.

## 10.1. The Reversal of Fates after Death

The reversal of the fates of the mighty and lowly, the rich and the poor, the insiders and the outsiders is a prominent theme in Luke's Gospel.[2] Many of these reversal texts have eschatological overtones; the reversal is a divine action which takes place in the future. This is evident, for example, in the beatitudes and woes where the poor, hungry, and bereaved are promised good things in the kingdom of God while the rich are threatened with the removal of the things they now enjoy (Lk 6:20–26). Expressions such as "salvation," "eternal life" and the like also occur in connection with other stories containing reversal, such as the Good Samaritan ("do this and you will live;" 10:28), the table fellowship instructions ("you will be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous;" 14:14), and the combination of

[1] The question is taken up and studied in detail by Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 108–18.
[2] Cf. above, p. 28, n. 87.

the stories of the rich ruler and Zacchaeus (the rich ruler is unable to gain the eternal life he is seeking while salvation has come to Zacchaeus; 18:18–30 and 19:1–10).[3] The Rich Man and Lazarus adds a new dimension to this teaching of an eschatological reversal by showing how the status in earthly life is reversed in the otherworld.

Some kind of a reversal is a basic concept in many accounts of otherworldly fate. Texts that describe judgment often include an element of surprise: those who appeared to be mighty and powerful are stripped of their might and glory. This is evident, for example, in the Platonic judgment scenes where tyrants and others who enjoyed a pre-eminent position on earth are condemned in the severest possible way. This is most explicit in the *Gorgias* which tells how the judges were formerly misled by the outward splendor of the dead, for ". . . many of those who have a wicked soul are clad in beautiful bodies and families and riches" (*Gorg.* 523c). Plutarch emphasizes the same thing in *De Sera*. Nobody can escape divine justice. If vengeance does not take place during one's lifetime, it will happen after death.[4]

The enactment of divine justice is fundamental to many Jewish writings as well. Even if the ungodly seem to prosper in their life and the pious suffer, things will be reversed after death. For example, in the Similitudes of Enoch, sinners are equated with kings, governors, exalted ones, and landlords who oppress the righteous (*1 En.* 62–63). But on the day of judgment, the sinners will be delivered to the angels of punishment, while the righteous, the elect ones, will be saved, "they shall eat and rest and rise with that Son of Man forever and ever" (62:14). In the same way, in 4 Ezra, the righteous in Israel are a reproach to their gentile oppressors on earth but will be exalted after the judgment (4 Ezra 6:55–7:44; cf. 4:22–32; 5:21–40). In *2 Baruch*, the Lord assures Baruch that even though this life is a struggle for the righteous, the world to come will be "a crown with great glory" (*2 Bar.* 15:8). According to the *Testament of Judah*, death means a reversal and life after it compensates for the injustice that prevails on earth (*T. Jud.* 25:4):

[3] York, *Last Shall Be First*, 131, 139, 160. On the other hand, sometimes the reversal is not an eschatological action but a present response, either acceptance or rejection of Jesus, e.g., in Lk 7:36–48.

[4] Cf. above pp. 93–95.

> Those who died in sorrow will be raised in joy; and those in poverty for the Lord's sake will be made rich; (those in need will be fed; and those in weakness will be strong);[5] and those who died for the Lord's sake will be wakened into life.[6]

The last-mentioned example is noteworthy as "Judah" speaks of a reversal from poverty to riches, closely resembling the Lukan beatitudes.[7] However, it is impossible to state with any certainty whether this represents a common Jewish motif or whether the passage is influenced by Luke's text.[8] All in all, there are not many texts that identify those whose fate is reversed as rich and poor. Undoubtedly this is one of the reasons why the Egyptian parallel has dominated the scholarly past so heavily. On the other hand, the Torah scholar and the tax-collector in the Rabbinic reversal story are not described as poor and rich,[9] but this has not prevented scholars from identifying this story as a close parallel to Luke's example story.

### *Lucian: Death as the Great Equalizer*

However, there are some stories that speak explicitly of a reversal between rich and poor. The theme is central in many works of Lucian of Samosata, most notably in the *Cataplus*.[10] The satire describes the journey to Hades of a rich tyrant named Megapenthes and a poor shoemaker, Micyllus. Death in Lucian's account, however, brings about not so much a reversal but an equalization.[11] The poor man rejoices because in Hades "everybody has the same privileges and nobody is different from his neighbor" (*Catapl.* 15). This is dreadful

[5] Some manuscripts omit the words in parentheses.

[6] Another reversal between two individuals is depicted in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a writing dated into the first centuries C.E. Abraham meets Azazel, the chief of the fallen angels. Abraham's angelic guide tells him to depart from Abraham and declares: "the garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him [Abraham] and the corruption which was on him has gone over to you." (*Apoc. Ab.* 13:12; trans. by Rubinkiewicz in *OTP 1*, 695.)

[7] Especially Lk 6:21: "Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God; blessed you who are hungry now, for you will be filled; blessed are you who weep now for you will laugh."

[8] The *Testaments*, as we now have them, are clearly a Christian text but the possibility that they are based on earlier Jewish testaments cannot be excluded. Be that as it may, the composer(s) of the *Testaments* use many traditional Jewish ideas. See the discussion in Hollander & de Jonge, *Testaments*, 82–85.

[9] Cf. above pp. 14–15.

[10] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 457–62; cf. p. 33.

[11] *Catapl.* 15; cf. 20; *Men.* 17, *Dial. mort.* 1 and 26.

for the rich tyrant who tries every means to escape from death. As the poor shoemaker puts it,

> . . . when he was to leave such an amount of gold and silver and clothes and horses and dinners and blooming youths and beautiful women, he naturally was distressed and grieved when he was dragged off from them. [. . .] As for me, as I had nothing at stake in life—no farm, no house, no gold, no house-gear, no reputation, no portraits—naturally I was girt up, and when Atropos only nodded at me, I gladly threw away the knife and the shoe-sole—for I had a boot in both hands—and started up at once barefoot, without even washing off the black dye, and followed; or rather I led the way looking forwards, for there was nothing behind me to turn me around and call me back.

Thus, death is pleasant for the shoemaker who has lived his life in poverty, and dreadful for the rich man who is deprived of his earthly luxury. The story also includes a scene of judgment (*Catapl.* 24–29). The poor man, who has been found innocent of all misdeeds, is taken to the Isles of the Blessed together with a Cynic philosopher, Cyniscus. The judge Rhadamanthys hesitates about the punishment of the rich man: should he be thrown into the burning river of fire, Pyriphlegethon, or turned over to the devouring dog, Cerberus. Cyniscus proposes another alternative which is accepted. The rich man is not allowed to drink the water of Lethe and thus will always remember what he has lost.

In the *Menippus*, the rich are also condemned after death. In this dialogue, the Cynic philosopher Menippus relates to a friend what he saw when he visited the underworld. He found out that, of all those who were sent to the Place of the Wicked, the rich are most severely punished.[12] Menippus would remind each rich man of his earthly lifestyle, which sounds familiar in the light of the Lukan story:

> How great he had been then, when many stood at his gateway (ἐπι τῶν πυλώνων) in the early morning awaiting his coming out, pushed away and shut out by servants. And when he finally appeared to them wearing something of purple (πορφυροῦς τις) or gold or embroidery, he thought he made fortunate and happy those who greeted him if he stretched out his breast or right hand to be kissed (*Men.* 12).

[12] According to the story, all are punished; kings, slaves, satraps, as well as poor, rich, and beggars, but poor people are getting only half as much torture and resting in intervals before being punished again; *Men.* 14, cf. *Men.* 12.

Even though death in these accounts also means torments for rich sinners, their most severe punishment is the remembrance of the things they lost, their luxurious lifestyle, fine clothing, etc. On the other hand, the poor, who on earth had no part in the luxury of the wealthy, find death a relief.

### *Epistle of Enoch: The Struggle between the Righteous and Sinners*

The reversal motif is especially prominent in one Jewish text, namely the Epistle of Enoch.[13] This writing depicts a struggle between two groups, the righteous and the sinners.[14] The sinners are accused of many typical ungodly deeds: cursing, blasphemy, devouring blood, leading others astray, despising the Torah, and worshiping idols (cf. 95:4; 96:7; 98:11,15; 99:2,7,14; 104:9). What is of special interest is that they are also identified by social terms; the sinners are rich and mighty (94:8; 96:4–5; 97:8–10) and they are frequently accused of oppressing and impoverishing the righteous (95:5–7; 96:5,8; 97:8; 98:13; 99:11,15; 100:7–8; 102:9).[15] The righteous are never explicitly called the poor but this may be inferred from their contrast to the sinners. They are "the lowly ones" (*1 En.* 96:5) whose earthly condition is described in the following manner:[16]

> In the days of our distress, we have toiled exceedingly and have been destroyed, we have become few and have found none to take our part. We have been crushed and have perished, we have given up in despair our hope to see deliverance again from day to day. We hoped to be the head but have become the tail. We have toiled as we worked but we have not been masters of the wages. We have become food for sinners, the lawless have made the yoke heavy on us. Those who master us, our enemies goad us and encompass us. We sought where to escape from them so that we might be at rest [. . .][17] We cried out

[13] *1 En.* 91–104. Different scholars frame the Epistle a little differently, for example Milik refers to chaps. 91–108 ("Problèmes de la literature Hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," 360), Nickelsburg both to chaps. 94–104 (*Resurrection*, 112) and to chaps. 92–105 ("Riches" and *1 Enoch*), and Collins to chaps. 91–108 (*Apocalyptic Imagination*, 43). Cf. above p. 130 n. 70.

[14] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 423–24.

[15] Cf. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Message of *1 Enoch* 92–105," 311; "Riches," 326–27.

[16] The major part of the Epistle of Enoch (97:6–104:13) has survived in Greek. Quotations from this part are my own translations. For the other parts, I use Nickelsburg's translation in his commentary on *1 Enoch*.

[17] Three lines are lost. The Ethiopic reads: ". . . but we found no place to which

> against those who were bringing us down and violating us, but they did not pay attention to our pleas and did not want to listen to our voice. They did not take our part, finding nothing against those who violate and devour us, but they strengthened them against us. They killed us and made us few. Concerning our murder they do not make it manifest and concerning the sinners they do not remember their sins (*1 En.* 103:9–15).

According to "Enoch", this is not the whole story, however, since the angels in heaven do remember the righteous and their fate will be changed. They will receive joy and consolation. Similarly, the rich who scorn and oppress them will be judged and destroyed. The point closely resembles that of the Lukan story: the inequality on earth will be compensated for in the world to come. God promises the righteous:

> Be of good courage because your evil things and distress have worn out. You will kindle like the lights of heaven, and you will be seen; and the windows of heaven will be opened for you. Your cry will be heard. Your judgment, for which you cry, will also be seen; inasmuch as it will assist you concerning your distress and from all who took part with those who violated and devoured you.[18] Do not fear for evil on the day of the great judgment, you will not be found as the sinners. [But you sinners] will be troubled, and there will be eternal judgment upon you for all the generations of the ages.[19] Fear not, you righteous, when you see the sinners growing strong and prospering; do not be partners with them, but keep far away from all their injustice (*1 En.* 104:2–6).[20]

The fate of the rich sinners is the opposite. Even though they have lived their earthly life in wealth and people deem them happy, death will reveal the truth. They will receive full retribution for their injustice. The torments that await them resemble the conditions of the rich man in Hades:

---

we might flee and be safe from them. Then, in our tribulation, we brought a charge against them before the authorities."

[18] The Greek is difficult and probably corrupt. Black suggests the translation "inasmuch as" for ἐφ' ὅσα; *Book of Enoch*, 316–17.

[19] The text is again confused; apparently something is missing from the beginning. The eternal judgment is clearly the fate of the sinners; yet the logic of the passage would require that it referred to the righteous all along; see Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 241–42.

[20] Cf. 96:1–3; 103:1–4.

> And you sinners who are dead, when you die, they will say of you: "Happy are the sinners all their days which they saw in their lifetime. They have died in honor and there was no judgment in their lifetime." You yourselves know that they will bring your souls down into Hades and they will be there in great pain and in darkness and in snare and in burning flame. And your souls will enter into the great judgment for all the generations of the ages. Woe to you, there is no rejoicing for you (*1 En.* 103:5–8).[21]

The contrast between the rich and the poor in the Epistle of Enoch is not unique within early Jewish literature.[22] The interrelationship between the indifference towards the poor and ungodliness is deeply rooted in the prophetic tradition.[23] The warning to the rich against relying on their wealth and oppressing the poor is likewise nothing new.[24] The writer of the Epistle of Enoch clearly draws from both the prophetic and the wisdom tradition.[25] What is new in the writing is the assurance that poverty and the attitude towards the poor are related to the otherworldly fate.[26] Those who oppress the poor

---

[21] Cf. 94:6–11; 96:4–8; 97:3–10; 98:9–16; 99:1–2, 11–16; 100:7–9.

[22] The contrast between the rich and the poor is emphasized, e.g., in Sir 13:17–23:
> What does a wolf have in common with a lamb? No more has a sinner with the devout. What peace is there between a hyena and a dog? And what peace between the rich and the poor? Wild asses in the wilderness are the prey of lions; likewise the poor are feeding grounds for the rich. Humility is an abomination to the proud; likewise the poor are an abomination to the rich. When the rich person totters, he is supported by friends, but when the humble falls, he is pushed away even by friends. If the rich person slips, many come to the rescue; he speaks unseemly words, but they justify him. If the humble person slips, they even criticize him; he talks sense, but is not given a hearing. The rich person speaks and all are silent; they extol to the clouds what he says. The poor person speaks and they say, "Who is this fellow?" And should he stumble, they even push him down.

[23] An example is Amos 5:11–12:
> Therefore because you trample on the poor and take from them levies of grain, you have built houses of hewn stone, but you shall not live in them; you have planted pleasant vineyards, but you shall not drink their wine. For I know how many are your transgressions, and how great are your sins—you who afflict the righteous, who take a bribe, and push aside the needy in the gate.

Sinners are also connected with oppressing the poor in several Psalms, e.g., Pss 10:2, 14–15; 37:14; 82:2–4; 94:3–6.

[24] E.g., Prov 22:16, 22–23: "Oppressing the poor in order to enrich oneself, and giving to the rich, will lead only to loss. Do not rob the poor because they are poor, or crush the afflicted at the gate; for the Lord pleads their cause and despoils of life those who despoil them." Cf. Pss 49:6–7; 52:9; Prov 11:28; 21:13; Wis 2:10–11,21.

[25] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Message," 318, 327.

[26] Bernstein, *Formation*, 241–42.

or do not take care for them will be punished after death. Accordingly, those who are poor on earth will be compensated. The message is similar to Abraham's words to the rich man in the Lukan story.

Similarities between Luke's gospel and the Epistle of Enoch have been often noted. A detailed comparison between Luke's special material and the last chapters of *1 Enoch* was made by Sverre Aalen.[27] According to him, the similarities can be seen both in the vocabulary and the content. A most striking instance is between the story of the rich fool (Lk 12:16–21) and the woe unto the rich in *1 Enoch* 97:8–10.[28] Both also resemble a sapiential saying in Sirach.[29] Aalen also points out to the special resemblance of the last chapters of *1 Enoch* to the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Both the writer of *1 Enoch* and Luke use the term τὰ ἀγαθά in the rendering of "earthly good" (Lk 16:25//*1 En.* 98:9), and describe the lot of the righteous on earth as bad (τὰ κακά; Lk 16:25//*1 En.* 98:13; 104:2). In both, the fate is reversed in the hereafter (cf. *1 En.* 98:9; 103:3; 104:5). Other similarities in the vocabulary include the phrases ἐν τῷ ζωῇ ὑμῶν/αὐτῶν (*1 En.* 102:5; 103:5), ἐν φλογὶ καιομένῃ (*1 En.* 103:8) and ὀδύνη (*1 En.* 102:11). Aalen considers these similarities so weighty that he is inclined to suggest literary dependency between the last chapters of *1 Enoch* and Luke's special material even though he does not take a final stand.[30]

---

[27] Aalen, "St. Luke's Gospel," 1–13.

[28] Aalen, "St. Luke's Gospel," 4, 11. The passage in *1 En.* reads:

> Woe unto you who acquire gold and silver not by reason of justice. You will say, "We have become rich with riches and have had and acquired possessions. Let us do whatever we want; for we have stored silver in our storerooms and plenty of goods in our houses, and it pours out like water." You deceive yourselves; for your wealth will not endure but quickly it will be taken from you, for you have acquired it all unjustly, and you shall be given over to a great curse.

[29] The passage of Sirach differs both from *1 Enoch* and Luke in that it is sympathetic towards the rich; see Nickelsburg, "Revisiting," 568. The passage reads:

> One becomes rich through diligence and self-denial, and the reward allotted to him is this: when he says, "I have found rest, and now I shall feast on my goods!" he does not know how long it will be until he leaves them to others and dies (Sir 11:18–19).

There is yet another parallel for the passage in the *Gospel of Thomas* (logion 63) but Aalen does not discuss it.

[30] Aalen, "St. Luke's Gospel," 5–6. His confidence is decreased by the abovementioned parallel in Sir, which, according to Aalen, might indicate that there is only common tradition behind the writings. In his appendix (p. 13), he suggests, however, that Luke might be the translator of *1 Enoch* into Greek!

Others have been more cautious concerning the relationship between the Epistle of Enoch and Luke's gospel. George W.E. Nickelsburg points out that the similarities in the vocabulary are not sufficient for postulating a literary dependency.[31] Moreover, the common vocabulary is found scattered here and there both in the last chapters of *1 Enoch* and in the material peculiar to Luke. This is the case especially concerning the assumed parallels between *1 Enoch* and the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. There are, then, no grounds for assuming a straight dependency between the writings. The similarities are explained by the common apocalyptic tradition.

Despite the above criticism, Nickelsburg shares the enthusiasm of Aalen concerning the similarities of the content.[32] The contrast between the rich and the poor, the mighty and the lowly, and the sudden death that meets the rich and brings with it a punishment in Hades occur in both writings. Both also share the demand to obey God's law.[33] According to both, God is on the side of the oppressed and riches will not help the rich. An example of the attitude toward the rich in *1 Enoch* is the following:

> Woe to you, rich, for in your riches you have trusted; from your riches you will depart, because you have not remembered the Most High in the days of your riches. You have committed blasphemy and iniquity; and you have been prepared for the day of bloodshed and the day of darkness and the day of great judgment. Thus I say and make known to you: He who created you will overturn you; and for your fall there will be no compassion, and your Creator will rejoice at your destruction (*1 En.* 94:8–10).[34]

The passage reveals an attitude typical of *1 Enoch*. The rich and powerful are always seen in a negative light. The rich are ungodly for they trust their riches instead of God. Moreover, they use their wealth to commit iniquity. According to some passages, the wealth is acquired by unjust means. God, however, will not tolerate this.

[31] Nickelsburg, "Riches," 325–26. Some of the words and phrases pointed out by Aalen, e.g. the verbs ἀπόλλυμι and ζάω, are so common that they do not constitute a convincing argument. Others are frequently used in the LXX and thus prove nothing concerning the relationship between *1 Enoch* and Luke. E.g., ὕψιστος occurs in the LXX as an epithet of God over 100 times.

[32] In his view, these similarities are especially striking in the Rich Man and Lazarus; a story that "most closely approximates Enochic idiom and imagery;" Nickelsburg, "Revisiting," 565.

[33] Lk 16:29–31; *1 En.* 99:2; 104:9; Aalen, "St. Luke's Gospel," 8.11.

[34] Translation by Nickelsburg.

He will judge the rich and punish them according to their deeds on earth. The riches will be taken away from them. The judgment is sudden and unexpected. This pattern is repeated in the last chapters of *1 Enoch* over and over again.[35]

According to Nickelsburg, Luke's treatment of riches includes similar features. Wealth may be acquired unjustly (Lk 16:1–9; 19:1–10). The rich are indifferent towards the poor (Lk 16:19–31) and they wrongly trust in their riches (Lk 12:16–21; 16:13). A sudden and unexpected judgment awaits them and their wealth will be taken away from them (Lk 1:52–53; 6:24–25; 12:20; 16:24–25). They will be punished according to what they have done or left undone (Lk 12:20; 16:14–15, 19–31).

The fate of the poor in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus is also described in terms similar to those used in *1 Enoch*. The poor live in misery on earth and suffer at the hands of the rich (or because of the rich). This injustice continues until they die. In *1 Enoch*, the sinners conclude that they can continue their ungodly lifestyle since everyone seems to die in the same manner and be taken to Hades (*1 En.* 102:4–11).[36] This, however, is a mistake. The coming judgment will correct the earthly injustice in two ways. First, the righteous will receive "goods" (ἀγαθά), "joy" (χαρά) and "honor" (τιμή) (*1 En.* 103:3; cf. 104:2). They will finally find the rest they sought in vain on earth (cf. *1 En.* 103:12). Secondly, the fate of the sinners will also reverse. The righteous may see the destruction of the wicked and may participate in punishing them (*1 En.* 95:3; 96:1). The reward of the poor in Luke's example story also includes both aspects. Lazarus not only receives consolation in the bosom of Abraham but also sees the torments the rich man suffers. However, this latter aspect is not emphasized and no point is made out of it. Contrary to the Enochic account, Lazarus does not take part in the punishing of the rich man. The words of Abraham in v. 26 ("Besides all this, between you and us a great chasm has been fixed, so that those

---

[35] See *1 En.* 94:6–7; 96:4–8; 97:8–10; 98:13–16; 99:11–16; 100:7–10; 102:9; 103:5–8; cf. Nickelsburg, "Riches," 326–32.

[36] This view has close affinities in the Jewish wisdom tradition, cf. Eccl 9:1–6. Even closer is the teaching in the second chapter of Wis. As everyone seems to face death in the same manner, the ungodly think that they may enjoy the good life has to offer (Wis 2:1–9) and that they can violate the righteous poor (Wis 2:10). This, however, is a mistake. Contrary to what the ungodly expect, man is imperishable (2:21).

who might want to pass from here to you cannot do so, and no one can cross from there to us") may imply that Lazarus would come to the rich man's aid were it only possible.

This is not the only difference. Another has to do with the way the rich are treated in both writings. Whereas the attitude towards the rich in *1 Enoch* is thoroughly negative, Luke's view contains other nuances as well.[37] Despite the many harsh words against the rich (e.g., Lk 6:24–26; 18:25) he does not rule out the possibility that, by sharing their wealth, renouncing their riches and giving alms to the poor, the rich may be saved (Lk 3:10–14; 12:33; 14:12–14; 16:1–9; 18:22; 19:8).[38] Thus, it seems more important for Luke to warn the rich, not to condemn them.[39] The exhortation to use wealth correctly is constantly strengthened by warning the rich of the coming judgment (Lk 9:25; 12:16–21; 20:45–47) when the fate of the rich and the poor will change (Lk 1:52–53; 6:20–26). That is why the rich must repent while they still have time. If they do, they will also be counted among the saved.

---

[37] Nickelsburg points out that the tone used in *1 Enoch* towards the rich is more condemnatory and harsh than in Luke; "Riches," 341; "Revisiting," 567. Differently, Paffenroth, *Story of Jesus*, 122–23. He argues that Luke's attitude towards wealth is negative while the more positive attitude must be ascribed to his sources. Accordingly, the way riches are viewed in Luke's special material is "quite lax indeed": it is enough to be generous but there is no need to renounce everything; possessions are viewed negatively only if they become the most important thing in one's life, as in Lk 12:16b–20; 16:19–31. However, the attitude in these pericopae can hardly be characterized as "lax"—the question of how to use one's wealth is a deadly serious matter and the wrong kind of use results in suffering and fiery flames for what seems to be an eternity!

[38] Sometimes scholars make a sharp distinction between the demand to renounce one's possessions and the right use of them. This is not necessarily the case. It is true that Luke has a habit of emphasizing how the disciples and other followers of Jesus leave everything, cf. Lk 5:28 (contrast Mk 2:14); 18:22 (contrast Mk 10:21). However, what else could the renouncing of one's possession mean in practice than their proper use? This is seen in the case of Levi when, after leaving everything (καταλιπὼν πάντα), he gives a big party in his house. How did he still have a house and be able to afford a party if he had literally left everything? Additionally, in the story of the rich ruler, the command to sell everything and give to the poor aims at the practice Luke elsewhere in his double work describes as the ideal use of one's possessions. The placement of the Zacchaeus story soon after the story of the rich ruler enforces this analogy.

[39] This is typical of Luke to whom the unity of the church is important. Moreover, Luke himself must have been wealthy. The fact that he was able to write a gospel indicates that he was educated and had the time and the means to dedicate himself to writing. In the words of Syreeni, Luke's overall attitude to the rich was ". . . sympathetic and pastoral rather than hostile;" *Making*, 136.

In *1 Enoch*, on the other hand, there is no such alternative. This difference is also seen in the way both writings understand the term "sinner." The writer of *1 Enoch* uses the term in the same way as it is used in the Hebrew Bible, most notably in the Psalms. "Sinner" in them is a symbol for the enemy of God; sinners are the thoroughly wicked who are excluded from the people of God. Repentance is utterly impossible for them, they are not and can under no circumstances become part of God's people.[40] That is why there is no point in exhorting them to repent. Thus, even though the Epistle of Enoch contains more woes to the rich than exhortations to the poor, the writing is directed to the "righteous" (according to their self-identification); that is, to the people who identify themselves with the oppressed.[41] The threat of the judgment functions as an encouragement to those who face injustice now and not as an exhortation to the rich to repent.

Luke, on the other hand, directs his message to both groups. The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, for example, is primarily told to the rich, as v. 14 indicates.[42] Luke does not just condemn them but exhorts them to repent—even though not much hope is left for them. Moreover, Luke's understanding of who the sinners are differs from that of *1 Enoch*. This is due to a shift in ideology (and terminology) that seems to have occurred in the intermediate period; for Luke, a "sinner" is an object of God's mercy.[43] Furthermore, in his story "sinners" are paradoxically "righteous." They are the heroes of his story, paradigmatic figures who recognize Jesus and respond to him in the right way.[44]

---

[40] Neale, *None But the Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke*, 86–88, 96–97, 193. According to him, the "sinners" form an ideological, not a social category, that is necessary for the self-identification of the "righteous:"

> In a sense, it makes absolutely no difference who the historical referent of a Psalm was because the "sinners" are, after all, exactly who the psalmist, or reader, *believes* them to be. They are the mental product of his world view. The "sinners" actually exist only in the mind of the reader. The category contains only people who are assigned to it by judgment of others (p. 97, emphasis original).

[41] Thus also Nickelsburg, "Riches," 327.

[42] Thus also Puech, *Croyance*, 257.

[43] Neale, *Sinners*, 91, 94–95, 193. This shift is seen in post-70 Pseudepigrapha, and may be partly due to Christian influence.

[44] Neale, *Sinners*, 114–15, 181. Cf. York, *Last Shall Be First*, 13, n. 5: "The term "sinner" (ἁμαρτωλός) functions as a technical term for outcasts of society who, in fact, are "righteous" because they receive the testimony of John and Jesus." This holds true for most passages where Luke uses the term ἁμαρτωλός. There are three

For this reason, the rich man in the example story, who is a villain and a cautionary example, cannot be called a sinner. He is simply—rich. As a matter of fact, Luke never explicitly associates the rich with sinners even though some of the "sinners" he describes are rich (most notably Zaccheus). This is all very different from *1 Enoch* where the rich and the sinners are one and the same group. After all, the contrast in *1 Enoch* is first and foremost between the sinners and the righteous. The first group is also called the rich and the mighty but these terms occur much less frequently than the term sinner (ἁμαρτωλός) and wicked (ἄδικος).[45] In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the contrast is between a rich man and a poor man, the first of whom is ungodly and unrepentant, but just for this reason cannot be called a sinner.

Even if not as close a parallel as at least Aalen assumed, the Epistle of Enoch is important as it shows that the theme of reversal was well-grounded in the apocalyptic context. Its description of both the earthly and the otherworldly conditions of rich and poor resembles Luke's example story. The reversal pattern in the example story fits both the overall apocalyptic context and Luke's own theology of reversal.

### *The Finality of the Reversal*

The reversal of fate in Luke's example story is final and it comes as a surprise to the rich man. Only after his death does he realize that he (and his brothers) should have listened to Moses and the prophets, that is, obeyed the law of God.[46] The idea that those whose fate is reversed for the worse realize it too late also occurs in other Jewish writings. In the Similitudes of Enoch, the "rulers and kings" who are being punished complain that it is only now that they have

exceptions: Lk 6:32–34 (the Q-saying concerning love of one's enemies; "even sinners love those who love them"), Lk 13:2 (the Galileans slaughtered by Pilate were no more sinful than the rest), and Lk 24:7 (the words of Jesus repeated by the angel at the tomb concerning Jesus' death: "the Son of Man must be handed over to sinners;" cf. the third passion prediction in Mk 14:41).

[45] The sinners are also called "fools" (ἄφρονες) and the righteous "wise" (φρόνιμοι) in *1 En.* 98:1, 9.

[46] The necessity of repentance for salvation is also evident in the words of Jesus in Lk 13:3: ". . . unless you repent, you will all perish as they did." The attitude of the rich man in his request in v. 24 is comparable to the astonishment of those who realize that they have been left outside the kingdom of God (Lk 13:28–29). Cf. Neale, *Sinners*, 166.

learned to know whom they should have revered in life (*1 En.* 63:1–7).[47] They plead that they might get even a little rest from their punishing angels in order to worship God and confess their sins. Their request is not granted, however, just like Abraham refuses the request of the rich man. It is too late to repent.

Similarly, in 4 Ezra the ungodly realize only at the judgment whom they have disobeyed. After death it is too late to regret and repent:

> Then those who have now abused my ways will be amazed, and those who have rejected them with contempt will dwell in torments. For however many who did not acknowledge me in their lifetime, although they received my benefits, and however many who scorned my Law while they still had freedom, and while an opportunity of repentance was still open to them did not understand but despised it, they must acknowledge it in torment after death (4 Ezra 9:9–12).[48]

The behavior and lifestyle of the rich man in the example story is very much the same: even though he received benefits in his life, he did not pay heed to God's law. He did not repent when it was still possible and realized his mistake only after death while being tormented. The *Testament of Abraham* also teaches that repentance is possible only before death. According to it, God, out of mercy, has prolonged the lives of sinners in order for them to repent and live (*T. Ab.* A 10:14).

The rich man cannot change his fate by appealing to Abraham nor can he affect the fate of his brothers. This topic is treated in other Jewish literature as well. The possibility of the righteous dead to intercede (on the day of judgment) for the ungodly is rejected in 4 Ezra:

> Then I asked: "If I have won your favor, tell me, your servant, also this. On the day of judgment will the righteous be able to intercede

[47] Cf. Bernstein, *Formation*, 193. A similar idea occurs in *Sib. Or.* 4,40.

[48] Cf. 4 Ezra 7:36–38.82; *2 Bar.* 85:12:

> For behold, the Most High will cause all these things to come. There will not be an opportunity to repent anymore, nor a limit to the times, nor a duration of the periods, nor a change to rest, nor an opportunity to prayer, nor sending up petition, nor giving knowledge, nor giving love, nor opportunity of repentance, nor supplicating for offenses, nor prayers of the fathers, nor intercessions of the prophets, nor help of the righteous. (Trans. by Klijn in *OTP 1*, 651–52)

Cf. also *L.A.B.* 33:2–3, see n. 54 below.

> for the wicked, or pray for them to the Most High? Or fathers for their sons, or sons for their parents, or brothers for brothers, or relatives and friends for their nearest and dearest?" He replied: "You have won favor in my eyes and I will tell you. The day of judgment is decisive,[49] and sets its seal on the truth for all to see. Just as in the present a father cannot send his son in his place, nor a son his father, a master his slave, nor a man his best friend, to be ill[50] for him, or sleep, or eat, or be cured by him, in the same way no one shall ever pray for another; when that day comes, everyone will be held responsible for his own righteousness or unrighteousness" (4 Ezra 7:102–105).[51]

In addition, in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo, intercession for others is denied. In her farewell speech, Deborah explicitly rejects the possibility that the righteous dead can pray for the living.[52] When people ask Deborah to remember them in the hereafter, she answers:

> While a man is still alive he can pray for himself and for his sons, but after his end he cannot pray or remember anyone. Therefore do not put your hope in your fathers. They will not profit you at all unless you be found like them (*L.A.B.* 33:5).[53]

The denial that the dead could intercede for the living also occurs in the Lukan story, even though the rich man is not among the righteous dead and does not request Abraham to intercede for his brothers. Other common features between the speech of Deborah and the Lukan story are the conviction that it is not possible to repent after death and the exhortation to obey the law in life.[54] As

[49] The Latin has *audax*, "stern" or "bold."

[50] The Latin is unintelligible as it has *intelligat* "understand." The correction is based on other versions (Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian).

[51] Cf. v. 115. Perhaps this teaching that the righteous cannot intercede for the wicked was one of the reasons why vv. 36–105 were removed from some manuscripts.

[52] The similarities between the speech of Deborah and the Lukan example story are pointed out by Reinmuth, "Ps.-Philo," especially 28–36. See also Puech, *Croyance*, 133–35.

[53] Cf. *2 Bar.* 42:7–8; 85:9.

[54] *L.A.B.* 33:2–3:

> Only direct your heart to the Lord your God during the time of your life, because after your death you cannot repent of those things in which you live. Truly at that time death is sealed up and completed, and the measure and the time and the years have returned in their deposit. Even if you seek in hell to do evil after your death, you cannot, because the desire for sinning will cease and the evil creation will lose its power, because even hell that has received what has been deposited in it will not restore it unless it be demanded by him who has made the deposit to it. Now then you, my sons, obey my voice, while you have the time of life and the light of the Law, make straight your ways.

repentance after death is too late, the otherworldly fate depends solely on the way of life on earth.

This is not the only view in Jewish sources. In some other writings, the righteous are said to be able to intercede for others. In the *Testament of Abraham*, Abraham and the archangel Michael pray for a soul whose good deeds and misdeeds are found to be equal. Their prayer is heard and the soul is taken into paradise (*T. Ab.* A 14). In this case, then, the prayer of a living person affects the fate of the dead. Similarly, Judas prays for his fallen soldiers in 2 Macc (12:39–45).[55] In another passage, intercession happens the other way around: the dead Onias and Jeremiah are praying for the people (2 Macc 15:12–16). According to the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, the dead saints, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the righteous, pray at a certain hour every day on behalf of the unrighteous dead who are being tormented (*Apoc. Zeph.* 10–11). It is not stated, however, whether this intercession has any affect. Further, according to the Slavonic version of *3 Baruch*,[56] Baruch is allowed to see the tortures of the wicked. He asks who the tormented ones are, as if he already saw them, and asks for permission to pray for them. His angelic guide gives the permission: "You also may cry for them; perhaps the Lord God will hear your voice and have mercy on them" (*3 Bar.* 16:8).[57]

## 10.2. Message from the World of the Dead

The other essential structural element in the example story is the possibility of revealing the fate of the dead to the living. This requires that two preconditions are met. First, the otherworldly rewards and punishments must take place contemporaneously with life on earth, not only in the last days.[58] Only then can the living be warned against suffering of the consequences of sin in the otherworld.[59] Second, there must be some means by which the living may acquire the information concerning the fate of the dead. In Luke's example

[55] Cf. p. 146 n. 156.
[56] *3 Bar.* 16:4–8; this addition is lacking from the Greek version; Harlow, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, 37.149–50.
[57] Translation by Gaylord in *OTP 1*, 678. This is the reading of the Slavonic manuscript S. Some other Slavonic manuscripts give the prayer in a shorter form, others in a longer form.
[58] McDannell & Lang, *Heaven*, 26–28.
[59] Bernstein, *Formation*, 246.

story, both of these requirements are met. The good and the bad fate are experienced immediately after death while the brothers of the rich man (together with Jesus and his audience or Luke and his audience) are still alive. The description in vv. 22 and 23 leaves no other alternative: "The poor man died and angels carried him to the bosom of Abraham. The rich man also died and was buried. In Hades, lifting up his eyes, being in torment, he saw Abraham . . ." There is no place in this scheme for judgment, resurrection or the like between the death of an individual and the transition to the otherworldly realm. Moreover, the rich man requests that Lazarus would act as a messenger and warn his brothers of the fate that will meet them if they do not repent.

There are numerous stories in antiquity in which the living are warned of the consequences of ungodly life or are otherwise informed of the conditions of the hereafter.[60] The request by the rich man in the example story to have Lazarus sent to warn his brothers is a variation on this theme. Even though the great chasm prevents transition from one part of the realm of the dead to another, the return of a dead person to earth seems quite possible. Abraham refuses the request on the grounds that it is unnecessary ("They have Moses and the prophets"), not because it is impossible.

Information on the fate of the dead could be acquired by several different means. One possibility was an otherworldly tour where a living person visited the realm of the dead.[61] Learning and disclosing the secrets of postmortem life is not the only reason for accomplishing a κατάβασις; a journey to the otherworld may be taken in order to receive information from one of the dead (Odysseus, Aeneas), or to try to recover a loved one (Eurydike, Alcestis), or to perform

[60] Both traditionally held parallels, the Demotic story of Setne and Si-Osire and the Rabbinic stories of the scholar and the tax collector, use this topos, though by different means; see above pp. 12–15. Another example of the use of the motif is the parallel suggested by Bultmann, the legend of the ungodly couple; cf. pp. 15–16. These are but a small sample of the many stories using the same motif; see Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 108–13.

[61] A good overview of otherworldly tours is in Bauckham's article; "Descents," 10–38; cf. Couliano, *Out of This World*. He points out that an otherworldly journey is such a widespread phenomenon that it may well be called universal; *Out of This World*, 6. A detailed account of Greek descents to the underworld is found in Ganschinietz, "Katabasis," 2395–447. In addition to the stories of descent to the underworld, there were also stories of ἀνάβασις, ascent to heaven. Some of these are told expressly to reveal the fate of the dead. See Tabor, *Things Unutterable*, 73–77; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 47–71.

a heroic deed (Hercules).[62] The reports of these journeys often also contain revelation concerning otherworldly conditions. Accounts of κατάβασις are widely spread across the ancient world: from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Ugarit, Persia and Greece. In the oldest known stories, the one who descends is usually a god or an otherwise exceptional, heroic individual. A common feature is that the κατάβασις—and especially the return—is exceptional and dangerous even for these superhuman figures.[63] It is made possible only under special circumstances and exceptional conditions. Normally, not even gods were allowed into the underworld.[64] In later writings, the tour in the world of the dead could also take place in a vision or a dream.[65]

An otherworldly tour is also a commonly used device in Jewish literature and occurs in several apocalyptic and related writings.[66] In the Jewish tradition, these tours were associated with ancient seers such as Enoch, Elijah, and Moses.[67] The oldest surviving Jewish description of such a tour is Enoch's cosmic journeys in the Book of the Watchers, *1 Enoch* 17–36.[68] Enoch's second tour is a circumnavigation around the perimeter of the earth and along it Enoch

---

[62] Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 65.

[63] In Mesopotamia, the underworld was "the land of no return"—which did not prevent the dead from visiting the living as ghosts; Bottéro, "Mythologie," 39–42; Scurlock, "Death and Afterlife," 1886–93. The difficulty of returning from Hades is also discussed, e.g., in the *Aeneid.* When Aeneas tells the Sibyl his wish to visit the underworld, the prophetess warns him that it is easy to descend there but hard to ascend from there. (The famous expression *hoc opus, hic labor est* refers to this difficulty.) However, in the narrative it is much harder for Aeneas to get to the abode of the dead, for the boatman Charon at first refuses to take him over. Coming back, on the other hand, seems fairly easy as Anchises just lets Aeneas and the Sibyl through an ivory gate for false dreams; *Aen.* 6, 893–98.

[64] For example, there are only two extant stories from Egypt that tell of a κατάβασις of a living person. One is the frequently mentioned story of Setne who visits the Amente with his divine son Si-Osire. The other one is recorded by Herodotus (2,122). According to this ironic story, the king of Egypt descended to the realm of the dead to play dice with Demeter (i.e., Isis).

[65] E.g., in Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*; see further above pp. 88–90.

[66] These are extensively discussed by Himmelfarb in her books *Tours of Hell* and *Ascent to Heaven.*

[67] As the earliest Jewish accounts of otherworldly tours were always about the great figures of the past, it is likely that stories of ordinary people visiting Hades—such as the story Bultmann offered as a parallel to the Lukan story—are late.

[68] Scholars often speak of two overlapping journeys, the first reported in chaps. 17–19, the second in chaps. 21–36; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 7; Himmelfarb, *Tours*, 50–52. Some view chaps. 33–36 as originally reporting a third journey that has later been inserted into the final section of the second journey; Stock-Hesketh, "Circles and Mirrors: Understanding *1 Enoch* 21–32," 29.

learns what happens to the souls after death.[69] At first, the fate of the dead was just one of the divine secrets that these cosmic tours revealed. Later, however, some apocalyptic accounts concentrated solely on the fate of the dead.[70]

In Hellenistic cosmology, the abode of the dead was often situated in heaven.[71] Accordingly, the cosmic tours were developed into accounts of journeys through the heavenly spheres. Most often these accounts involve a scheme of seven heavens,[72] as in *2 Enoch* and the *Ascension of Isaiah*.[73] Others, however, depict three heavens, as in the *Testament of Levi*.[74] An interesting case is *3 Baruch* that speaks of five heavens.[75] It comes as no surprise that paradise, the abode of the righteous dead, is situated in the heavens, but interestingly, in many accounts, the dwelling place of the wicked is also there and the visitor to heaven sees both places. For example, in *2 Enoch*, both paradise and hell are situated in the third heaven ready to receive the

[69] The circle along which Enoch travels has two mirror-image halves, the western and the eastern half. The west is the world of death; it is barren and terrible, characterized by fire, heavenly bodies, terrible places, and the place where the souls of the dead await their judgment. The east is the world of life, fruitful and delightful, characterized by water, sweet-smelling trees, spices, and the garden of righteousness. See Stock-Hesketh, "Circles and Mirrors," 29–37, image on p. 30.

[70] See Bauckham, "Early Jewish Visions," 79–80.

[71] Cf. Tabor, *Things Unutterable*, 63–69.

[72] See Yarbro Collins, "Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature," 1260–66.

[73] *2 En.* 3–20; *Ascen. Isa.* 7–10; cf. *Apoc. Mos.* 35; *Apoc. Ab.* 19.

[74] *T. Levi* 2–3; cf. 2 Cor 12:2. Later the text of *T. Levi* was modified to include seven heavens; Yarbro Collins, "Numerical Symbolism," 1261.

[75] There is no agreement on whether this represents the original number of heavens or whether the end has been truncated and the writing originally reflected a seven-heaven cosmology. For example, according to Bauckham, the writing originally described Baruch's journey through seven heavens; "Early Jewish Visions', 68–69; cf. Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 90–91. Differently, e.g., Picard, *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*, 76–77 and Harlow, *3 Baruch*, 34–76. The latter argues in detail that the end, as we now have it in the Greek version, is original. According to him, the account of the ascent is deliberately aborted. The writer of the text assumed a seven-heaven cosmology but cut the ascent short for polemical reasons. According to Harlow, this polemic is directed against those who envision the temple as an integral part of eschatological hope. The lesson the writer wants to teach is the importance of the deeds of human beings and their daily recompense. However, Harlow's arguments for the narrative preparations for the aborted ascent (pp. 56–64) are not very convincing. If the point is that a human being is distanced from the Most High and cannot see the glory of God and thus ascend to the two highest heavens, this could have been stated explicitly and not hinted at in such a manner that only a present-day scholar finds the original purpose.

righteous and the sinners respectively after the judgment.[76] In *3 Baruch*, the three lowest heavens are reserved for people who are not righteous. The builders and planners of the tower of Babel are in the first two heavens. They are not actually suffering but have been made into forms of animals.[77] Probably in the third heaven,[78] there is a huge dragon whose belly is Hades but this vision is not described in any more detail. Paul's vision of paradise in 2 Corinthians 12:2–4 also remains obscure. The account of his ecstatic experience is unique among the numerous ancient reports of otherworldly tours since it records an autobiographical experience. Paul does not relate his experience in detail—the things he heard are ἄρρητα ῥήματα, unutterable things.[79]

Alternatively, contact with the world of the dead could take place the other way around: a dead person could come back to the world of the living either permanently or as a ghost or in a dream.[80] In the former case, the stories are always about temporary death. The heroes of these stories, only apparently dead, are either only visitors in the hereafter who are urged to tell of their experiences to the living or they are taken to the otherworld by accident and are returned back to the world of the living. The classic example that later writers often imitate, is, of course, Plato's account of Er.[81] As the visitor is only temporarily dead, these kinds of stories are actually

---

[76] *2 En.* 8–10. The fact that the paradise is situated as low as the third heaven in a seven-heaven cosmology might be a reminiscent of the three-heaven scheme; Collins, "Afterlife," 133.

[77] The dwellers of the first heaven have faces of oxen, horns of stags, feet of goat, and hindquarters of lambs; those in the second heaven look like dogs with stags' feet.

[78] Baruch goes through the first two heavens in chaps. 2–3. The entrance into the third heaven is likely intended in 4:2. However, in the beginning of chap. 10, the text reads: ". . . he took me into a third heaven." Yet Baruch is conducted to the fifth heaven in the beginning of chap. 11, which makes it likely that a fourth heaven is mentioned in chap. 10 and the phenomena described in chaps. 4–9 are actually situated in the third heaven.

[79] Tabor, *Things Unutterable*, 113–25; Aejmelaeus, *Schwachheit als Waffe: Die Argumentation des Paulus im "Tränenbrief" (2. Kor 10–13)*, 237–38. Cf. below pp. 280–81.

[80] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 111–12; Bernstein, *Formation*, 93–104; cf. Johnston, *Restless Dead*.

[81] *Resp.* 10,614d–621b; see above pp. 73–74. Plutarch clearly imitates Plato in his corresponding account (*Sera* 22–33) and Lucian parodies the same theme (*Philops.* 25–26). The motif of a temporary death is also used in Christian accounts. A typical way of using it is in different *actae* where an apostle raises up a recently dead person. The resurrected one then tells about the fate (usually of the punished ones) as a warning for others. E.g., the *Acts of Thomas* 51–59 offers a case in point.

variation on the theme of a νέκυια, a visit of a living person to the abode of the dead. The only difference between these stories and the accounts of a true κατάβασις is the fact that the visitors to the otherworldly realm are supposed to be dead, even if they are not.

The other variation on the theme, the appearance of a dead person in a vision or a dream, is very old and truly universal.[82] In the Greek world, it occurs as early as in Homer, who tells of the appearance of the ghost of Patroclus to Achilles after he has been killed in battle (*Il.* 23,65–107). The reason for his visit is his request for burial since he is not allowed to enter Hades without a proper burial.[83] The same motif occurs in many later Greek and Latin accounts. Often the dead appear in order to ask the living to do something to improve their conditions in the hereafter or to warn or console the living or to reveal some important information.[84]

The same narrative motif is also used in Jewish accounts, a prime example of which is the Rabbinic story of the Torah scholar and the tax-collector. The deceased Torah scholar appears in a dream precisely in order to reveal the fate of the dead. As already noted, the Lukan example story resembles more the Rabbinic story than the Demotic tale in this respect.[85] The example story does not reveal the conditions in the hereafter by means of a νέκυια. This makes its connection to the Demotic tale of Setne and Si-Osire, a prime example of the νέκυια genre, far more remote than might be concluded on the basis of the scholarly tradition. In the Lukan story, there is no otherworldly journey; the question is whether a dead person will return on earth to bring a message to the living.

There is yet another Jewish story with even closer affinity to Luke's example story. This is the *Story of Jannes and Jambres*, also called the *Penitence of Jannes and Jambres* in some sources. The story is extant only in a very fragmentary form.[86] This makes it extremely hard to

---

[82] Bottero, "Mythologie," 39–42.

[83] The rejection of the unburied dead from the underworld is a common belief throughout the world; Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 9–10.

[84] Examples of such stories are collected by Bernstein, *Formation*, 94–98.

[85] See above p. 36.

[86] Fragments of one Latin and three Greek manuscripts have been preserved. The Latin fragments were published for the first time in 1861 but received wider scholarly attention with James' publication in 1901 ("A Fragment of the 'Penitence of Jannes and Jambres,'" 573–74). The Greek fragments were first published in 1951 but correctly identified and republished by Maraval in 1977 ("Fragments grecs du livre de Jannès et Jambré," 201–203). Fragments of another Greek manuscript

give even a rough estimate of its date and origin.[87] In any case, it is based on a widely-circulated legend according to which Jannes and Jambres were the Egyptian magicians who challenged Moses.[88] In the Exodus story, the magicians remain nameless[89] but the names might appear as early as in the *Damascus Document*.[90] The brothers are named with certainty in the New Testament,[91] and authors as diverse as Pliny the Elder[92] and Origen[93] refer to them. Even though the similarities of the story with the Rich Man and Lazarus were already noted in passing by the first editors,[94] it is Richard Bauckham who has paid special attention to the common features of this story and the Lukan example story. According to him, of all the accounts that tell about a message from the world of the dead, it offers the closest parallel to the Lukan story.[95]

The surviving fragments allow us to know that Jannes is punished for his opposition to Moses and dies. Jambres performs necromancy with the aid of the magical books his brother entrusted to him before his death and summons the shade of Jannes from Hades.[96] Unfortunately, the Greek text is so fragmentary that it is not possible to

have been known since 1974 and were published in 1994 by Pietersma (*The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres the Magicians*, 96–261). The fragments of the third known manuscripts remain unpublished. All published fragments are conveniently collected and translated in Pietersma, *Apocryphon*. A preliminary English translation (by Pietersma and Lutz) also appears in *OTP 2*, 437–42.

[87] According to Pietersma, ". . . it is likely that our book originated no later than ii A.D. and a date in i A.D. is quite plausible. In an Egyptian context either date assures a Jewish rather than Christian origin." *Apocryphon*, 58.

[88] The various traditions concerning Jannes and Jambres are collected in Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 24–35.

[89] Exod 7:11–22; 8:3, 14–15; 9:11.

[90] CD 5:18–19 speaks of "Yohanah and his brother" whom "Belial raised up in his cunning, when Israel was saved the first time" (trans. by Pietersma). It remains uncertain whether this is a reference to Jannes and Jambres; see Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 12–13. Pietersma does not acknowledge the connection.

[91] The writer of 2 Tim describes his opponents: "As Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so these people, of corrupt mind and counterfeit faith, also oppose the truth" (3:8).

[92] Pliny includes "Moses, Jannes, and Lotapes" in his list of Jewish magicians in *Nat.* 30,2,11.

[93] Origen also offers the earliest reference to a book written about Jannes and Jambres; *Comm. ser. Matt.* 117 (p. 316 in Vogt, *Der Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus*; cf. pp. 77–78).

[94] Cf. James, "Fragment," 576.

[95] See his article "Rich Man and Lazarus," 112–16.

[96] See the reconstructed text in Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 214 (lines 19–22). This is also attested by the Latin fragment, lines 1–3.

reconstruct the contents of Jannes' speech with any certainty. The speech, however, apparently made up a considerable portion of the text and thus formed a crucial part of it.[97] Judging from the surviving text, Jannes seems to have described at length different punishments in hell. He might also have referred to death as the great equalizer of different human fates; in Hades, king and slave, rich and poor are all equal. The reconstruction of the text, however, is very conjectural and is thus doubtful.[98]

As far as Jannes' fate in Hades is concerned, the Latin text is more helpful.[99] According to it, Jannes confesses that his own death was justified since he opposed Moses and Aaron. His dwelling place is now in the netherworld where there is a great burning (*combustio magna*) and a lake of perdition (*lacus perditionis*), impossible to ascend from.[100] He exhorts his brother to treat his sons and fellow men well as long as he lives since in Hades there is nothing good, only sorrow (*tristitia*) and darkness (*tenebre*).[101] After his death, Jambres will receive an abode two cubits wide and four cubits long.[102]

The account contains some striking similarities with Luke's example story. Bauckham suggests that the common elements include that a dead brother who suffers in Hades reveals his fate to the living brother and calls upon him to repent. However, some cautiousness is in order. First, the fact that the message is received by (a) brother(s) is not a unique feature. In most stories of messages from the world of the dead, the receiver is a close relative (husband, wife, parents, siblings). Second, it is not the rich man himself who would appear to his brothers in Luke's story but Lazarus. Thus, the situation is not, strictly speaking, the same. Third, the way the message is conveyed differs in both accounts. Jambres receives the message through his own active deed, necromancy, which is not suggested in Luke's

---

[97] Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 56. According to his estimation, the speech covered approximately six pages of the 22 pages represented by the fragments.

[98] See Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 246–48.

[99] See the text and its translation in Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 280–81.

[100] Also the Greek text refers to burning . . . κεόμενα ὑπό . . . Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 240–41 (line 25 of the reconstructed text).

[101] The Greek text agrees and speaks of something that is "full of darkness," σκότους πλήρης; Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 240–41 (line 24 of the reconstructed text).

[102] This has a counterpart in Greek, see the reconstructed text in Pietersma, *Apocryphon*, 233 (lines 4–5). The habitation of the soul in Hades is thus described as an equivalent to the grave. The identification of Hades and the grave was common; see above p. 105.

story. Finally, there is a difference in the mode of exhortation. At least according to the Latin text, Jannes does not threaten his brother with punishment; only that he can no longer do good deeds in Hades. Whether the punishment he himself suffers (burning in the lake of perdition) serves as a threat remains obscure. Be that as it may, the story of Jannes and Jambres shows—once again—that the motif of receiving a message from the world of the dead was widely known and used in antiquity.

But does the rich man wish that Lazarus would merely visit his brothers (probably in a dream) or does he expect him to return to life?[103] The requests themselves in vv. 27–28 and 30 indicate that a short visit would suffice. This solution is also supported by the fact that, in all other such stories, a permanent return is possible only in the case of temporary death. The visitor, who is actually still alive, is always returned before the judgment and he never ends up in the final destination like Lazarus in the story. Moreover, it is unlikely that the story would suggest that Lazarus would leave his blessed place by Abraham to return to the miserable conditions of his earthly life. On the other hand, Abraham talks about resurrection in v. 31 (οὐδ᾽ ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ πεισθήσονται). "Resurrection" clearly refers to a permanent new life, not to a temporary visit to earth. However, the choice of words might have happened on other grounds, as an allusion to the resurrection of Jesus.[104] In this case, it does not necessarily have anything to do with speculation on the means of Lazarus' return.[105] It is quite likely that Luke did not picture the return of Lazarus in any concrete way; after all Lazarus does not return but Abraham refuses this possibility.

---

[103] The question is raised by Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 114–15.

[104] Crossan, *In Parables*, 65. Strikingly, resurrection and faith are also discussed in connection with the other New Testament figure named Lazarus, namely the Lazarus of Bethany in John 11. This would point to some connection between these two stories. The fundamental differences in the stories suggest, however, that the relationship is not a simple one. Most scholars explain the connection by assuming some kind of common traditional background for both stories; e.g., Brown, *John 2*, 429; Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium 2*, 429–30; Kremer, *Lukas*, 167; Busse, "Johannes und Lukas: die Lazarusperikope, Frucht eines Kommunikationsprozesses," 304; Leaney, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 225; Berger, *Im Anfang*, 206–207; Bretherton, "Lazarus of Bethany: Resurrection or Resuscitation," 172.

[105] The verb form ἀναστῇ has several textual variants. Tanghe argues that the original form is the variant ἀπελθῇ, "Abraham," 560–63. Were this true, the difficulties in the interpretation of Lazarus' return would disappear. However, the external evidence for this variant is weak, which makes it impossible to regard Tanghe's

Abraham's refusal is the crucial point of the whole example story for Bauckham.[106] It is exactly this feature which distinguishes the example story from all the other ancient accounts of messengers from the world of the dead. In Bauckham's view, the teller of the example story (Jesus) built the story using narrative motifs familiar to his audience, the reversal of the fate of the rich man and the poor man and the message from the world of the dead. The point of the story is found in the refusal of the rich man's request which is not expected by the audience. This would come as a shocking surprise.

This view involves two problems. First, it cannot be assumed *a priori* that the teller of the example story, Jesus or, as I have argued,[107] Luke, intended to shock his audience. Why would Jesus always say something new and unexpected? In stressing this, Bauckham actually comes close to Jeremias' view, which he criticizes in other respects.[108] Second, it is simply not true that the fate of the dead is not revealed. The passing of a message to the brothers is refused; they have no other alternative than to heed the law and the prophets. Yet the audience, both the audience of Jesus (who, according to Bauckham, would be surprised by the refusal) and the listeners and readers of the gospel become well aware of the conditions in the hereafter and the means of avoiding the undesirable fate.

This, of course, is the purpose of all the other revelations of the afterworld as well. When Plato has Socrates relate the myth of Er, he is not addressing the account to Er's audience nor to Socrates' audience but to his own readers (and listeners). Similarly, whatever the main message of Jannes to his brother, it is not addressed only

---

argument as "persuasive" (as does Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 115). To read ἀπελθῇ instead of ἀναστῇ allows Bauckham to interpret the return of Lazarus as a temporary visit. It is, however, methodologically problematic to lean on such modest textual evidence (only the fifth century codex W together with old Latin and some Syriac translations; in addition papyrus $P^{75}$ and a few others have ἐγερθῇ). This is also not necessary if the verb ἀνίστημι is understood as an allusion to Jesus and his resurrection. Bauckham, who regards the whole example story an authentic teaching of Jesus, rejects this alternative:

> Of course, it is possible that ἀναστῇ belongs to the Lukan redaction of the parable and is intended to carry a secondary overtone of reference to the resurrection of Jesus, but if so the overtone is not only secondary but artificial. The risen Jesus did not appear to unbelieving Jews to reveal the fate of people like them in the afterlife.

[106] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 115–18.
[107] Cf. the discussion on pp. 22–29.
[108] Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus," 101–102.

to Jambres but first and foremost to those who read and listen to the story. In this respect, Luke's story does not differ from other accounts depicting messages from the otherworld. In the example story, the messenger is not Lazarus but Jesus who tells the story both to his own audience (the Pharisees and the disciples) and to the readers/hearers of the gospel.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

# DETAILS OF THE DESCRIPTION

Even though Luke's example story is not intended as a revelation of the otherworldly life as such, it contains several details that allude to the conditions in the hereafter.[1] Angels carry the dead Lazarus into Abraham's bosom. There he is consoled and apparently has access to refreshing water. The rich man finds himself in torment, in fire. Between the abode of Lazarus and the abode of the rich man, there is a dividing chasm that prevents crossing from one place to the other. Moreover, the dead are described in bodily terms; the rich man is said to have a tongue and Lazarus a finger (or at least a tip of a finger).

On the other hand, a story is, after all, a story, and the details serve first and foremost a narrative function. For example, the distance between the rich man on the one hand and Lazarus and Abraham on the other (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν; v. 23) underlines the magnitude of the reversal. On earth, the poor man lived close to the rich man (πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ; v. 20), in the otherworld, the distance between them has grown greatly. Communication between the rich man and Abraham is necessary since otherwise the dialogic structure would not be possible. Thus, there is no need to wonder how close the places of bliss and torment are to each other or how the rich man and Abraham are able to communicate if they are far apart.[2] The great insurmountable chasm also represents the greatness and permanence of the reversal. On earth, the men were separated only by a gate which could have been opened. After their deaths, this opportunity is lost.[3]

---

[1] Cf. above pp. 169–70.

[2] Cf. Plummer: "The Jews believed that Gehenna and paradise are close to one another [. . .] We need not to suppose that the parable teaches *us* to believe this. The details of the picture cannot be insisted upon;" *S. Luke*, 394.

[3] The different borders and the (im)possibility of crossing them form the core of Schnider's and Stenger's reading; "Offene Tür," 281. Cf. Scott, *Hear Then*, 158–59. According to them, the failure of the rich man on earth was that he did not open his gate for his poor neighbor to pass through. Thus he finds another, this time an insurmountable border, in the otherworld. This kind of reading is interesting

In this way, many of the details of the Lukan description strengthen the moral of the story.[4] This notwithstanding, many of the details have counterparts in the otherworldly accounts in both Jewish and pagan literature.[5] This means that Luke has composed his afterlife scene using familiar ideas and images. The afterlife imagery is not itself unexpected or surprising but Luke has chosen the details of the description according to such parameters as to make the otherworldly scene culturally acceptable. In the following, some of the details of the afterlife scene are examined more closely. These include the angels as escorts of the dead, Abraham's role in the hereafter, the description of the otherworldly consolation and torment, the dividing chasm, and the apparent corporeality of the dead.

## 11.1. Angels Escorting the Dead

The good lot of Lazarus is anticipated by angels who escort him on his way: "The poor man died and angels took him into Abraham's bosom" (v. 22). Even though this is the only reference to angels escorting the dead in Luke's double work, angels otherwise play a significant role in his eschatological scenes. He refers to angels in several apocalyptic passages. At the end of time, the Son of Man returns ". . . in his glory and the glory of the Father and the holy angels." (Lk 9:26).[6] In another passage, the Son of Man is said to

but it seems to be somewhat superfluous and thus it remains dubious that the possibility (and later, impossibility) of bridging the distance between the two men is the point of Luke's story. As Tanghe has remarked, the word πυλῶν refers to a portico (cf. Acts 10:17; 12:13) not a gate which could be opened or closed. If the emphasis in the story were on the possibility of crossing borders, a more proper word would have been θύρα; cf. Lk. 11:7; 13:25; Acts 5:7,9. Additionally, the preposition used (πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα) indicates that the poor man is "at" the rich man's gate, not "in front" of it, as if ready to cross over (in that case the preposition should be πρό, ἔμπροσθεν, ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον or the like); "Abraham," 564–67. The gate is, then, not really in between the rich man and the poor man. Instead, it indicates the characteristic place of the poor man on earth. Similarly, the characteristic place of the rich man is τράπεζα, the table where he could satiate himself. Cf. Jensen, "Diesseits and Jenseits," 42.

[4] Bernstein, *Formation*, 240.

[5] For example, the idea that the righteous and the wicked souls may communicate in the hereafter already occurs in the works of Plato. In his description, other dead keep away from the company of an unclean soul; *Phaed.* 108b–c. In the closing myth of the *Republic* (10,614e–615a), the cleansed souls gather after their journey to exchange their experiences. Cf. Plutarch, *Lat. viv.* 1130.

[6] The passage has synoptic parallels. According to Mk 8:38, the Son of Man

confess and deny "before the angels of God" those who confess and deny him in the face of men (Lk 12:8–9).[7] In the parable of the lost coin, Jesus says that "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner who repents" (Lk 15:10). Thus Luke seems to have a special interest in angels,[8] especially in an eschatological context.[9]

The dead souls are also described as having an escort in many Greek texts. They are not ἄγγελοι, however, for the word was reserved for messengers, usually human ones but sometimes also, e.g., birds.[10] There were also some divine messengers, the most important of whom was Hermes. One of his many roles was to serve as the messenger of the gods and to carry out the orders of Zeus, and for this reason he is also often called an ἄγγελος.[11] Another important role of Hermes was to act as an escort of the dead. In this respect, he resembles the divine ἄγγελοι who have this same function in Judaism of the late antiquity.[12] In the earliest accounts, that is, the earliest parts of the Homeric poems, the dead reach Hades by themselves, without the aid of any psychopompic figure.[13] However, as early as the last book of the *Odyssey*, it is Hermes who leads the dead suitors to Hades.[14] The escorting role of Hermes, who is frequently called by such epithets as ψυχαγωγός and ψυχοπομπός,[15] becomes

---

returns "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Cf. Mt 16:27: ". . . the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father."

[7] Vv. 12:8–9 derive from Q but the Matthean parallel (Mt 10:32–33) does not mention angels but "my father."

[8] Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, 29–30. The same can also be said of Matthew who resembles Luke in both emphasizing the angelic role in the birth narrative and in eschatological contexts.

[9] This is true irrespective the fact that Luke has omitted the mention of angels who gather the elect from all over the world from Jesus' apocalyptic speech; cf. Mk 13:24–27//Mt 24:29–31//Lk 21:25–28. The omission may perhaps be explained by the addition of v. 28.

[10] For example, Sophocles calls the nightingale Διὸς ἄγγελος.

[11] Cf. Hom. *hDem.* 407 where Hermes is depicted as ἐριούνιος ἄγγελος ὠκύς. Cf. Hom. *hHerm.* 572; Plato *Crat.* 407e.

[12] This is argued by Deutsch, *Guardians*, 164–67.

[13] Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 59.

[14] *Od.* 24,1–15. Other early references to Hermes as a psychopomp include Hom. *hDem.* 377–85 and *hHerm.* 571–72, and the ancient myth of Sisyphus. The cunning Sisyphus escapes from Hades but Hermes escorts him back; for details, see Sourvinou-Inwood, "Crime and Punishment," 48. Thus Hermes both guides the dead to the lower world and controls their access to the upper world.

[15] Hermes was known as a crosser of borders in general, and this idea was extended to include the crossing of the border between Hades and earth; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 104–105.

commonplace in later literature.[16] According to Diogenes Laertius, Hermes' role as a psychopomp was part of the doctrine of the Pythagoreans: "Hermes is the dispenser of the souls and for this reason he is called escort, and gate-keeper, and the subterranean one, since he is the one who brings in the souls from their bodies, both from land and sea" (8,31). Hermes is also depicted as a psychopomp in epitaphs, both literary[17] and those found on actual graves,[18] and in artistic representations. For example, he appears on white-ground *lekythoi*, oil-jars used in tomb-cults.[19] In addition to Hermes, there are other mythological figures with escorting functions, such as Charon, whose role is usually to ferry the dead over to Hades.[20]

In Greek mythology, there were also divine beings, subordinate to the gods but they were not ἄγγελοι but δαίμονες. The concept of δαίμων is extremely ambiguous and the word denotes several different ideas.[21] Over the course of time, however, it became more and more to mean lesser spirits and intermediaries between gods and human beings.[22] For example, one way Plato uses the word δαίμων is as a

[16] Sophocles *Aj.* 831–32; Euripides *Alc.* 743–44. According to the reconstruction of West, he was mentioned in the Rhapsodic theogony; *Orphic Poems*, 75. In Hellenistic and Roman times, Hermes as a psychopomp is mentioned frequently; cf. Lucian, *Luct.* 6, *Char.* 2, *Dial. mort* 14, *Dial. d.* 4. For more references see Stein, "Hermes," 789–90.

[17] *Anth. Pal.* 7,91,545.

[18] Lattimore, *Themes*, 35–36,51; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 184–85.

[19] Garland, *Greek Way*, 154. On one of them, Hermes is depicted as patiently awaiting a woman who adjusts her hair for her final journey; see the photograph on p. 57.

[20] Euripides *Alc.* 253–54,360–611,439–41; Aristophanes *Ran.* 139–40, 180–269; *Lys.* 605–607; Lucian *Catapl.* and *Charon passim.* In many depictions, Hermes takes the dead to the border of Hades, from where Charon ferries them over but sometimes these roles fluctuate. Hermes can be depicted as assisting in the otherworldly passage and as weighing the souls. Euripides gives Charon the epithet "a psychopomp holding an oar" (οὐπὶ κώπῃ ψυχοπομπός; *Alc.* 360–61); see Garland, *Greek Way*, 55–56. According to Garland, this kind of confusion is a sign "either of diffidence or—more probably—indifference regarding the actuality of the next world on the part of the Greek imagination." Equally well, however, it indicates that, in different traditions, certain important functions, such as escorting the dead and helping them along the way, were assigned to different characters. More on Hermes, Charon, and their psychopompic function in Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 303–61.

[21] See the thorough survey of Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in Early Imperial Period," esp. pp. 2069–91. In Homer, the word is used as an equivalent of θεός and θεά or a more impersonal divine power. Later δαίμων was often equated with Fate. According to Hesiod, the deceased of the Golden Age became δαίμονες who guarded and protected people; *Op.* 122–26. Both εὐδαίμων (good fate) and κακοδαίμων (bad fate) were known. A δαίμων could also refer to the soul of any departed or the divine part of human beings.

[22] Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon," 2068–69. This does not mean that the

guardian spirit who accompanies human beings in this life and acts as a prosecutor or advocate at the postmortem judgment.[23] Each person is accompanied by his or her δαίμων who leads the soul to the gathering place before the judge after the person's death. A guide is needed since it is easy to get lost in Hades. Later Platonists adopt and elaborate the idea.[24] In the Hellenistic period, this kind of belief in both good and bad δαίμονες seems to have been widespread.[25]

Similar dualism can be seen in Jewish angelology of the same time. Apocalyptic writings show a clear increase in speculations concerning the divine world and its inhabitants.[26] Angels already belong to earlier tradition, for example, the angel of Yahweh, who acts as God's visible personality, has a prominent role in many Hebrew Bible texts.[27] Otherwise angels function predominantly as attendants at Yahweh's heavenly court or as his messengers.[28] Even though the angels are innumerable in many texts, they remain nameless and their characterization is scarce. Only in apocalyptic angelology, different angels received hierarchical positions, names, numbers, special characteristics and functions. Earlier, this development was

use of the word was reduced only to mean such spiritual beings but different renderings existed side by side. See the warnings against making Greek daimonology into a too coherent system in Smith, "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity," 432–37.

[23] Thus Plato *Phaed.* 107d–e; *Resp.* 10,617d–e; 620d–e. This is by no means the only way in which Plato uses the word. A δαίμων is also a lesser divinity (*Apol.* 27c–e), a departed soul (*Crat.* 397e–398c), and an intermediate spirit (*Symp.* 202d–203a); Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon," 2085–86.

[24] For example, in Plutarch's account (*Sera* 564f), Thespesius' guide is the soul of a kinsman. In *Gen. Socr.* (592a–b), the directing δαίμων is the soul's own νοῦς element which floats above the soul like a cork.

[25] According to Brenk, belief in δαίμονες was part of the "folk superstition to be indulgently smiled at by the intelligent;" *In Mist Apparelled*, 83. Philosophical legitimation was given to it by Xenocrates, a pupil of Plato, in the latter half of the 4th century B.C.E. Only a few fragments of Xenocrates survive but judging on them, he gave a strong impetus to Greek daimonology. Xenocrates seems to have included both good and evil δαίμονες in his concept. This "was extremely close to that which Christians are raised on, the existence of spirits above men and below God, namely angels and devils;" Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 51. On Xenocrates, see Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 22–39, esp. 30–32.

[26] Kittel, 79 in Grundmann & von Rad & Kittel, "ἄγγελος;" Newsom, 248–49 in Newsom and Watson, "Angels."

[27] Newsom, 250 in Newsom and Watson, "Angels." The concept מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה has received keen scholarly attention. According to Newsom, it can be understood either as "the" angel of Yahweh or "an" angel of Yahweh.

[28] See, e.g., Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*, 60–63; Newsom, 249–51 in Newsom and Watson, "Angels."

explained by extra-biblical influence[29] but in more recent studies it is seen first and foremost as an intra-Jewish affair.[30]

In addition to the same functions the angels have in the Hebrew Bible, they also acquired new ones in the apocalypses.[31] They guide the visionaries on their heavenly tours, act as agents for God's will, and interpret the heavenly visions.[32] In a few writings, they are also

[29] Both Babylonian and Persian influence has been suggested, see, e.g., Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200 B.C.–A.D. 100*, 257–62.

[30] Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*, 3–13, 118–19. According to him, the most important component in the development was the exegesis on the biblical texts; the basis for the names and functions of different angels were received from the biblical tradition. This may well be true but it still leaves the unanswered question of why there was a need for a more developed angelology. The classic answer has been that intermediary beings were needed because God became more transcendent and was perceived as more remote from his people; cf. Russell, *Method and Message*, 237–38; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 69. This explanation has been widely rejected, partly due to the anti-Jewish bias associated with it; Olyan, *Thousand Thousands*, 8–9. On the other hand, Collins argues that the claim of a more distant God does not necessarily imply a negative view of Judaism and may be explained by the socio-political changes that occurred in the ancient Near East when the local ruler was displaced by a remote ruler in a distant place such as Persia or Rome. In his view, the increased interest in the heavenly world was stimulated by Zoroastrian teaching and probably also had to do with dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple cult; *Apocalypticism*, 130–34. However, the Zoroastrian influence is also in this respect hard to detect (cf. p. 124 n. 37) and it seems safer to assume that there were several different currents in the Hellenistic milieu that gave an impetus to the growth of Jewish angelology. It is also questionable whether the reason for the growing angelological interest can be reduced to a single model: instead of arguing for either the transcendence or the immanence of God in the Hellenistic period, it is more fruitful to see him as both transcendent and immanent; cf. Deutsch, *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*, 9. Different people might have envisioned the relationship between God and the world differently and thus had different reasons for angelological speculations. Moreover, the significance of angelology was not equally strong for all the various Jewish groups, as Newsom notes (252 in Newsom & Watson, "Angels").

[31] For details, see Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 132–73.

[32] In *1 En.*, Enoch has several different angelic guides. In the Book of the Watchers, they are Uriel (chaps. 18–19, 21, 27, and 33), Raphael (chaps. 22 and 32), Raguel (chap. 23), and Michael (chaps. 24–25). In the Similitudes of Enoch, the angel is usually not named (cf. 40:8; 43:3; 46:2; 52:3; 53:4; 54:4; 56:2; 60:11,24; 61:2; 64:2; 71:14–16), sometimes it is Michael (60:4–10; 71:3–5). In the Astronomical Book (chaps. 72–82), the guide is Uriel. In *2 En.*, Enoch is guided by two anonymous angels to the edge of the seventh heaven. From thereon, he is guided and instructed by Gabriel (chap. 21), Michael (chap. 22), Vrevoil (chaps. 22–23), and finally God himself (chaps. 24–36). In 4 Ezra, the guides are Uriel and Remiel, *2 Bar.* has Remiel (chaps. 55–76). In *3 Bar.*, Baruch is led by the angel Phamael (the Slavonic version has Phanuel, cf. *1 En.* 40:9; 71:8,13). In *Apoc. Ab.*, the angel is Iaoel, in *T. Ab.* Michael, in *Apoc. Zeph.* and *T. Job* (chaps. 2–5) the *angelus interpres* remains nameless.

associated with receiving and escorting the dead.[33] In the *Testament of Asher* there is a description, which resembles Luke 16:22:

> For the end of human beings displays their righteousness, when they come to know the angels of the Lord and the Devil. For if a troubled soul departs, it is tormented by the evil spirit which it served in desires and evil works. But if (a soul departs) peacefully in joy he comes to know the angel of peace who calls him into life (*T. Ash.* 6:4–6).[34]

Facing either a good or an evil spirit at death is a manifestation of the two-way thinking deeply rooted in Jewish covenant theology.[35] According to this thinking, there are two ways between which everyone must make a choice, one leading to life, the other one to death. Two kinds of spirits, the spirits of truth and the spirits of error guide along these ways.[36] In the above-quoted passage of the *Testament of Asher*, the good angels receive the followers of the right way as they die. This comes very close to the image in the Lukan story.[37] The question arises, however, whether the description comes too close to the Lukan imagery; the possibility that the passage is dependent on Luke's story cannot be excluded with certainty. It must be kept in mind that the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* is extant only in Christian manuscripts from the Byzantine period.[38] Even though the composer of the writing undoubtedly used many traditional Jewish ideas, these ideas are not always easily discerned.

---

[33] According to Davidson, all these references are later than Luke's description; *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*, 11. This might be true, considering the late manuscript evidence. However, this does not necessarily mean that the idea of angels as the escorts of the dead did not belong to pre-Lukan Jewish angelology. See Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien*, 154–55.

[34] The idea of good and evil angels receiving the dead has a counterpart in Zoroastrian belief where the dead are met by the soul's double. For the righteous, it is a beautiful young girl who guides the soul to paradise. For the wicked, it is a "horrible old hag" who takes them to hell; J. Davies, *Death*, 43; cf. Couliano, *Out of This World*, 106.

[35] See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 156–65. Cf. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 153–55.

[36] Other texts that refer to the two spirits include, e.g., 1QS 3:13–4:26; *T. Jud.* 20; *T. Ash.* 1:3–9. Cf. Wis 1–5.

[37] The troubled soul is said to be tormented (βασανίζεται) by the evil spirit; cf. the torments of the rich man (ἐν βασάνοις) in v. 23. There is also another verbal similarity between the passages but the verb is not used in the same sense. The angel of peace calls the good soul into life (παρακάλεσει αὐτόν ἐν ζώην), the poor man is consoled (παρακαλεῖται) in Abraham's bosom.

[38] Cf. p. 173 n. 8.

The difference between the passage in the *Testament of Asher* and the Rich Man and Lazarus is naturally that Luke does not mention any evil spirit receiving and tormenting the rich man. However, the idea of punitive angels occurs in other Jewish writings of the same age. The Similitudes of Enoch tells how the angels of punishment receive the sinners.[39] Angels of destruction were also known in Qumran.[40] Philo speaks of beings that are subordinate to God and through whom God punishes human beings.[41] These punishments are not, however, necessarily associated with life after death. Matthew also speaks of angels who await the ungodly. In a passage peculiar to Matthew, the application to the parable of the tares, Jesus explains how "the Son of Man will send his angels, and they will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers" (Mt 13:41). It is perhaps worth noting that here, as also in Philo, the angels are not said to be evil, or servants of the Devil but they belong to the Son of Man (or to God in Philo) and obey his commandments. Another New Testament passage that speaks of angels receiving the dead is Jude 9. According to it, the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses.

Angels appear escorting the dead only in later writings.[42] In the *Testament of Abraham*, angels lead the souls, both the good and the wicked, through the heavenly gates to face the judgment and, after the judgment, the wicked souls to the place of the wicked and the good souls to the place of the righteous (*T. Ab.* A 11:5; 13:12–13).[43] Moreover, the soul who is saved through Abraham's prayer is taken into paradise by a luminous angel (*T. Ab.* A 14:8) while two fiery angels drive the evil souls, beating them with fiery scourges (*T. Ab.* A 12:1–3). A similar image is used in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*: ugly

---

[39] According to *1En.* 62:11–12 (trans. by Knibb):

> . . . the angels of punishment will take them, that they may repay them for the wrong which they did to his children and to his chosen ones. And they will become a spectacle to the righteous and to his chosen ones; they [the righteous] will rejoice over them [the sinners], for the anger of the Lord of Spirits will rest upon them, and the sword of the Lord of Spirits will be drunk with them.

[40] The lot of the wicked who "walk in the paths of darkness" will be "a glut of punishments at the hands of all the angels of destruction;" 1QS 4:12.

[41] Philo calls them "chastisers" (αἱ κολαστήριοι), *Conf.* 171; cf. *Fug.* 66.

[42] For references, see Hollander & de Jonge, *Testaments*, 357.

[43] See Kolenkow, "The Angelology of the Testament of Abraham," 157–59. The description of two gates and two roads leading from them is another instance of the two-way theology. The idea of a road dividing into two in Hades appears in many Greek accounts, in Pindar, Plato, and the gold leaves.

angels with fiery scourges drive the ungodly souls and punish them this way in the air for three days, after which they cast them into eternal punishment (*Apoc. Zeph.* 4:1–7). According to the *Apocalypse of Moses*, a six-winged seraphim carries the dying Adam to be purified in the Acherusian lake and the archangel Michael takes him to paradise to wait for the day of judgment (*Apoc. Mos.* 37:3–6). It is also possible that angels are said to come and fetch the soul of the dying Job in the *Testament of Job*, but this is probably a later addition.[44] According to Pseudo-Philo, two angels escort the ghost of Samuel when the witch raises him up in the necromantic act (*L.A.B.* 64:6).[45]

Teaching concerning good and bad angels became a part of Christian apocalypticism.[46] Part of this belief seems to be the idea of angels escorting the dead to their otherworldly destiny, as attested by passages such as Lk 16:22 and Mt 13:42. There is no definite answer to the question of why Luke has only mentioned good angels escorting the poor man and no punishing angels leading the rich man. In v. 22, the deaths of both men are contrasted. Both men die and the poor man is taken care of by angels while the rich man is buried: "The poor man died and angels carried him to Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried." Extravagant burial is, of course, a natural end of the earthly life of a rich man, but Luke does not make a point out of it. The burial of the rich man serves more as a colorful detail in his description. However, the mentioning of the burial serves as a sufficient counterpart for the angelic treatment of the poor man and thus leaves no room for a more detailed description of any angels of punishment.

---

[44] According to one manuscript of *T. Job* (designated V), v. 52:2 reads: "After those three days he saw the holy angels who had come for his soul." In the other two Greek manuscripts, the words "holy angels" are absent (similarly also in *T. Job* 47:11; 52:5,6,8.) According to Brock, the addition in manuscript V is secondary; Brock, *Testamentum Iobi*, 9.

[45] The mention of the escorting angels is probably an elaboration of the biblical description (1 Sam 28:13) where the witch calls the ghost of Samuel אֱלֹהִים.

[46] It is hardly an accident that angels have a role in the resurrection narratives of all the gospels; see Mk 16:5–7 (called νεανίσκος), Mt 28:2–7; Lk 24:4–7 (called ἄνδρες δύο; cf. 24:23 where the word ἄγγελος is used), John 20:12–13. Angels are also connected with resurrection belief in other NT passages (Mk 12:25 par.; Acts 23:8–9) as well as in many Pseudepigrapha; Puech, *Croyance*, 207.

## 11.2. Abraham in the Hereafter

One of the important functions of the angelic guides in Jewish apocalyptic writings is to interpret the divine will. In Luke's story, the angels are only in a minor role and the mediator of God's will is Abraham who explains to the rich man why his requests cannot be granted. The rich man needs a partner in the dialogue but why specifically Abraham? Why has he such a prominent role as a spokesman of God? Comparison with other biblical and extra-biblical sources reveals that this role of Abraham is far from being unique.

To start with, Abraham also has a role in the otherworld in other passages in the synoptic tradition. Abraham and other patriarchs share in the eternal blessing in the Q-saying behind Mt 8:11–12 and Lk 13:28–29. Those who are worthy of entering the kingdom of God will feast with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and—according to a Lukan addition—with all the prophets:

> There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrown out. Then people will come from east and west, from north and south, and will eat in the kingdom of God.[47]

The patriarchs are also mentioned in the controversy with the Sadducees concerning resurrection (Lk 20:27–38 par.). There Jesus refers to God as "the God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob" which, according to him, is a proof of resurrection of the dead. Especially the Lukan version makes it clear that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob live with God. Whereas Mark makes Jesus say: "He is God not of the dead, but of the living," Luke adds: "He is God not of the dead, but of the living; for to him all of them are alive" (πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν; Lk 20:38; cf. Mk 12:27). This seems to indicate that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive and already dwell somewhere with God.[48]

The belief that Abraham and other patriarchs already share the blessed life also occurs in other Jewish writings. Usually the three "arch patriarchs," Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, are mentioned by

[47] Cf. the Matthean version: "I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the heirs of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

[48] For a fuller treatment of the passage, see below pp. 259–62.

name and they are described as awaiting the righteous in the hereafter to receive their souls. Especially two passages in 4 Maccabees come close to the Lukan controversy with the Sadducees. In his eulogy of the martyred Eleazar, the writer speaks of the pious who believe ". . . that to God they do not die, as our patriarchs Abraham and Isaac and Jacob died not, but live to God" (ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ; 4 Macc 7:19). Similarly, the mother and her seven martyred sons knew that ". . . those who die for God's sake live to God (ζῶσιν τῷ θεῷ) just as Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs" (4 Macc 16:25). In a third passage, the patriarchs are said to be ready to receive the righteous dead. The brothers, who are preparing themselves for martyrdom, console each other and declare: "As we die in this fashion Abraham and Isaac and Jacob will receive us, and all our fathers will praise us" (4 Macc 13:17).

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob also have a prominent role in the eschatology of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. For example, "Judah" tells his sons how in the last days ". . . Abraham and Isaac and Jacob will be resurrected to life and I and my brothers will be leaders [wielding] our scepter in Israel" (*T. Jud.* 25:1). Differently from the 4 Maccabees, this passage teaches that also the patriarchs await resurrection (in some kind of an intermediate state?), and will enter the blessed life with the other resurrected ones. The three patriarchs are also mentioned in a resurrection context in the *Testament of Levi*: "Then Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will rejoice, and I, too, shall be glad, and all the holy ones will be clothed in righteousness" (*T. Levi* 18:14). In the *Testament of Benjamin*, Enoch, Noah and Shem are also counted among the patriarchs:[49] "Then you will see Enoch, Noah and Shem and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob being raised up at the right hand in exultation. Then we also will be raised, each of us over our tribe" (*T. Benj.* 10:6–7).[50]

The idea of the patriarchs receiving the righteous dead is probably an expansion of the Hebrew Bible image of death as "going to one's

---

[49] Thus according to the text in Hollander & de Jonge, *Testaments*, 437. Different manuscripts give a somewhat different list of patriarchs. Some refer only to Noah and Shem (besides Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), others mention Enoch and Seth.

[50] Cf. *Apoc. Zeph.* where Enoch, Elijah, and David are mentioned as already sharing the heavenly bliss together with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. On his heavenly tour Zepahaniah observes how his angelic guide runs to "all the righteous ones, namely, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Enoch and Elijah and David" and speaks to them "as a friend to a friend" (*Apoc. Zeph.* 9:4).

fathers." The death of an individual is expressed by phrases such as "to be gathered to one's people" and "to sleep with one's ancestors."[51] These expressions reflect either the custom of burying the dead in family graves or their assumed union with their ancestors in the world of the dead, or both.[52] A similar phrase is frequently used in the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.[53] Originally, the expression did not involve any conscious existence with one's ancestors, but reflected the traditional view of a shadowy existence in Sheol. It was, however, used after the more individual ideas of life after death had become widespread. Then "the fathers" also acquired a new, active life beyond the grave, ready to receive the righteous dead and associate with them in the blissful life. At the same time, "the fathers" were understood not so much as one's own ancestors but as the holy figures of the nation's past, such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which probably reflected a shift from a family cult to a more nationalistic cult.[54] The same imagery also occurs in epitaphs with a wish that the deceased would "sleep in peace with the righteous ones," the righteous ones being the biblical patriarchs.[55]

In the Jewish tradition, Abraham was associated with eschatological secrets. Over the course of time, the story of God's promise to Abraham[56] was understood as also including a revelation concerning the coming ages. For example, 4 Ezra speaks of Abraham: "You loved him, and to him alone you revealed the end of the times,

[51] For instance, God promises Abraham: "you shall go to your ancestors in peace; you shall be buried in a good old age;" Gen 15:15. Cf. Gen 25:8; 35:29; 47:30; 49:33; Deut 31:16; Judg 2:10; 1 Kgs 1:21; 2:10; 11:21,43.

[52] Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 240–41. These two do not have to be mutually exclusive, cf. above p. 105.

[53] E.g., in 1 Macc 2:69; 4 Macc 5:37; 18:23; *Jub.* 23:1; 45:15; *L.A.B.* 19:2,6; 24:5; 28:10; 29:4; 33:6; 40:4,9; *2 Bar.* 3:2; 44:2; *T. Sim.* 8:1 *T. Levi* 19:4; *T. Mos.* 1:15. Interestingly, the daughter of Jephthah is told to fall "in the bosom of her mothers" (*in sinum matrum suarum*; *L.A.B.* 40:4). Deborah, on the other hand, is said to "sleep with her fathers" (*L.A.B.* 33:6).

[54] Cf. McDannell & Lang, *Heaven*, 10–11.

[55] Van der Horst, *Ancient*, 117. According to his reading, the "sleep" refers to a blissful existence in paradise. For a somewhat less confident view, see Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife*, 112–21. In Greek epitaphs, the metaphor of sleep is also used in contexts where being asleep does not seem to contradict being active in the otherworld; see examples in Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 69–72. One of them, a second century C.E. epitaph, reads: "Sleep holds you, blessed, much-loved, god-like Sabinus; you live as a hero and have not turned into a corpse. You sleep as if you were still alive, under the trees in your tomb. For the souls of the very pious live on."

[56] Cf. Gen 15:7–21.

secretly by night" (4 Ezra 3:14).[57] Later, extensive heavenly journeys were ascribed to Abraham, as in the *Testament of Abraham* (10–15) and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (9–32).[58] Abraham is also mentioned in an eschatological context in the gospel of John where Jesus proclaims to the Jews: "Your ancestor Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day; he saw it and was glad" (John 8:56). Behind this passage undoubtedly lie traditions that associated Abraham with the end of time and eschatological celebration.[59]

In the light of all this, Abraham's prominent role in Luke's account is thus easy to understand. Abraham, the first of all the patriarchs, was the one with special eschatological knowledge. At the same time, he represents all the patriarchs and other righteous figures of the past. The mention of Abraham alone is sufficient as the rich man does not need more than one person to talk with.[60] Abraham is also a fitting partner for the rich man for other reasons. In later tradition, Abraham was known for both his wealth[61] and his hospitality.[62]

---

[57] Cf. *2 Bar.* 4:4; *L.A.B.* 23:6; *Gen. Rab.* 44:25.

[58] See Ward, "Abraham Traditions in Early Christianity," 179.

[59] Hakola, *Identity Matters*, 193.

[60] In Rabbinic literature, Abraham is also mentioned alone in the otherworld. In the Rabbinic version of the martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons, the mother tells her youngest son: "My son, go and say to your father Abraham: 'Thou didst bind one [son to the] altar, but I bound seven altars;'" *bGit.* 57b (trans. by Simon in the Soncino edition). In another passage, Abraham is said to release the wicked in Israel from Gehenna (apparently after their due punishment), bring them up and receive them; *bErub.* 19a.

[61] Abraham's wealth is implied in Gen 13:2; 14:13–24; 23:13–16; 25:7–11. This trait is emphasized especially by Herzog, *Subversive Speech*, 130. According to him, the wealth of both Abraham and the rich man would make it natural for the audience to consider the rich man as Abraham's kin. The shock value of the story lies in the shaking of the existing social order when Abraham rejects the rich man and accepts Lazarus. This is hardly the case, however. In the story, Abraham does not deny his kinship to the rich man, on the contrary (τέκνον, v. 25). At least in theory, he would also be willing to receive the rich man, had he lived according to God's will.

[62] Hospitality is a major characterization of Abraham in later Jewish tradition. This tradition was based on Gen 18:1–15 where Abraham is said to receive three strangers. The Rabbis explained that Abraham's virtue exceeded that of Job's because Abraham fed any strangers while Job fed only those accustomed to eating with him; Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*, 84–85. Cf. Philo *Abr.* 107,114–16,132; Josephus *A.J.* 1,196.200; *T. Ab.* A 1:1–25; 2:2; 4:6; 17:7; 20:15; B 4:10; 13:5. For more, see Harrington, "Abraham Traditions," 169–70; Ward, "Abraham Traditions in the Testament of Abraham and in the "Rewritten Bible" of the Intertestamental Period," 183; Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*, 187, 195.

These qualities place him in direct opposition to the rich man: Abraham represents the way of life the rich man failed to lead.

An overview of Luke's double work reveals that Abraham is an important figure for Luke. A total of twelve passages refer to him[63] and seven of these speak of him as the father of the Jewish people or about his progeny.[64] The rich man's addressing Abraham as his father reminds the reader of the words of John the Baptist in the beginning of the gospel: "Bear fruits worthy of repentance. Do not begin to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father [NRSV: ancestor]'; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham" (Lk 3:8; par. Mt 3:7–10). The "fruits worthy of repentance" are exactly what the rich man failed to produce. And if the brothers of the rich man do not repent, their destiny will also be in the place of torment. Calling Abraham "father" does not help—as John's sermon made clear.[65]

The terminology concerning the "children of Abraham" is also used in several passages in 4 Maccabees.[66] In all these, however, the appellation "Abraham's child" (or the like) is used to designate someone who shows extreme piety and willingness for self-sacrifice.[67] Luke seems to understand the concept of being Abraham's progeny in a less typological sense. Nowhere does he refer to Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac[68] but Abraham is the father of all the Jews who are "the descendants of God's covenant" (Acts 3:25). The designation of the rich man as Abraham's child allows Luke to direct his criticism of the rich against Jews as well.[69]

In Luke's account, Abraham also represents authority. As the story does not involve a scene of judgment, Abraham takes the place of a judge when he confirms the divine verdict.[70] An otherworldly judge is a prominent figure in most ancient accounts of life after death.[71]

---

[63] Lk 1:46–55,67–79; 3:8–9,23–38; 13:10–17,28–29; 16:19–31; 19:1–10; 20:27–40; Acts 3:13–26; 7:1–53; 13:16–41.

[64] Lk 1:55; 3:8; 13:16; 16:22–31; 19:9; Acts 3:25; 13:26.

[65] Cf. Nave, *Role*, 185–87.

[66] Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," 141–42; Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*, 43–46.

[67] Seim, *Double Message*, 47.

[68] Seim, *Double Message*, 49, n. 72.

[69] Cf. above pp. 168–69.

[70] Even though the judgment is not explicitly mentioned or described in the story, it is implied in the differentiated destinies of the men. Cf. Hiers, "Day of Judgment," 80.

[71] According to Griffiths, this is due to Egyptian influence. There were several

There could be no differentiation of fates without a judgment. The judges pronounce the verdict which seals the fate of the dead. There is already an underworld judge in the Homeric account. He is Minos, the son of Zeus (*Od.* 11,568). However, since the fate of all the dead is equal, his role is not actually to judge the dead; he simply continues his earthly occupation. The earliest mention of a judge whose verdict determines the fate of the dead is in the odes of Pindar (*Ol.* 2,59). This judge remains anonymous. In Plato's accounts, there are several judges. According to the *Gorgias*, Radamanthys judges the souls coming from Asia and Aeacus[72] those from Europe. Minos has the ultimate vote if the others are uncertain in their verdicts.[73] Virgil names Minos as the judge who allows the dead in Hades and Rhadamanthys as the one who sends the dead either to Tartarus or Elysium.[74] A heavenly judge is also an important figure in many Jewish accounts. In the judgment scene of the Book of the Watchers, the judge is called the Great Glory (*1 En.* 14:20–23), which apparently refers to God himself, as also does the Ancient of Days, the judge in Dan 7.[75] In *T. Ab.*, the judge of the dead is Abel. However, after his verdict there will be two additional judgments: at the παρουσία, every spirit will be judged by the twelve tribes of Israel, and finally they will be judged by God (*T. Ab.* A 13:2–8).

In Luke's story, there is no judgment scene and Abraham is not the judge. He functions as the mediator of God's will who explains why the outcome of the verdict is as it is. The absence of a judgment scene should not be stressed too much. Luke's intention is not to tell what happens to the individual after death step by step but to warn of the consequences of an ungodly life. A judgment scene

otherworldly judges in Egyptian mythology such as Re, Osiris, and Anubis. The judgment scene is most commonly depicted with three gods. An enthroned Osiris is witnessing the balancing of the scales. Anubis (or Horus) is in charge of the actual balancing while Thoth is doing the recording; *Divine Verdict*, 204–207, 227.

[72] Aeacus has several roles in Hades. In Aristophanes' comedy, he is the janitor in the house of Pluto. Lucian usually depicts him, probably imitating Aristophanes, as a gate-keeper in Hades (*Men.* 8, *Dial. mort.* 6) but also as a collector of the arriving dead (*Cat.* 4).

[73] *Gorg.* 523e–524a. A fourth judge, Triptolemus, is mentioned in *Apol.* 40c–41c and *Resp.* 10,614c–d.

[74] *Aen.* 6,566. Cf. Ps. Plato *Ax.* 371b; Lucian *Catapl.* 13; *Ver. hist.* 6–10; *Luct.* 7 (together with Minos). For more references, see Malten, "Ῥαδάμανθυς," 34. On otherworldly judges mentioned in epitaphs, see Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 60–63.

[75] Cf. *1 En.* 90:20–38 (part of the Animal Apocalypse) where the judge is the Lord (of the sheep) and 4 Ezra 7:33–44 where the judge is simply the Most High.

is not necessary for this purpose. The blunt description of the rich man plunged straight into torment is rhetorically powerful and takes him straight to his point.

### 11.3. Torment of the Rich Man, Consolation of Lazarus

The conditions of the two men are stated in an almost laconic manner. The rich man finds himself in torment (ἐν βασάνοις, v. 23). He suffers (ὀδυνῶμαι, v. 24; ὀδυνᾶσαι, v. 25) in a flame of fire (ἐν φλογὶ ταύτῃ) and is desirous of refreshing water to cool his tongue. Lazarus, on the other hand, is taken into the bosom of Abraham (εἰς κόλπον Ἀβραάμ, v. 22, cf. v. 23) where he is consoled (παρακαλεῖται). Nothing else is said. The sparse description invites the reader to imagine what wonderful things Lazarus is now enjoying. On the other hand, the detail of water actualizes the agony of the rich man. How terrible his fate in fire must be if just one drop of water from the fingertip of Lazarus would make his condition better.[76]

Both forms of punitive devices, fire and thirst, are extremely frequent in both pagan and Jewish accounts of otherworldly punishments. Even though other forms of punishments are also described, such as lying in mud, carrying water in a sieve or other futile work,[77] fire is perhaps the most common way of describing the punishment of the wicked.[78] Rivers of fire are already associated with Tartarus in the Platonic myths and burning in fire belongs to the common imagery of otherworldly punishments in Hellenistic and Roman times.[79] Thirst is one of the punishments described by Homer, and Tantalus' fate is repeated in several later descriptions.

[76] In this respect, the description of the two men in the otherworld resembles the description of their earthly life. In both Luke combines overall characteristics ("feasted sumptuously every day," "is consoled," etc.) and lively details (purple and linen, sores and dogs, a drop of water from the fingertip).

[77] For more on these, see Graf, *Eleusis*, 103–20.

[78] Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, 224–25; Lang, "πῦρ," 928–32. Perhaps for the first time in Greek literature, fire is equated with the subterranean Hades in the poems of Empedocles; Kingsley, *Ancient Philosophy*, 72–73. Fire as punishment for the wicked also occurs in Egyptian mythology; Griffith, *Divine Verdict*, 232–33. However, it is not among the different punishments described in the Demotic story of Setne and Si-Osire.

[79] *Phaed.* 111e–112a,113a–b; cf. Ps.-Plato *Ax.* 372a, Plutarch *Gen. Socr.* 590f; *Superst.* 167a; Virgil *Aen.* 6,550; Lucian *Men.* 14; *Luct.* 8.

Suffering in fire is also the most common image of postmortem punishment in Jewish descriptions. As early as in the underworld description of the Book of the Watchers, there is a fiery river, closely associated with the Greek Pyriphlegethon.[80] Both the fallen angels and stars are led into the depths of fire and locked up in eternal pain and imprisonment (*1 En.* 10:13; 18:9–16). The same imagery occurs in the Animal Apocalypse of the Book of Dreams (*1 En.* 90:24–26). In the Epistle of Enoch, there are various punishments for the sinners, including burning flame (*1 En.* 103:8).[81] The spirits of the sinners and blasphemers are thrown into a place resembling an invisible cloud that is both completely dark and burning brightly since it is a flame of fire (*1 En.* 108:4–6).

Despite the affinities with Greek concepts, the fiery imagery is deeply rooted in the Hebrew Bible traditions.[82] It is often used as the means of God's destruction, as in Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:24).[83] Fire is also associated with the Valley of Hinnom (Ge-hinnom) where offerings were burnt for idols (2 Kgs 23:10; Jer 7:31; 32:35).[84] Fire is often part of the eschatological judgment both in the prophetic tradition and the pseudepigrapha[85] and Luke also uses it this way (Lk 9:54; 12:49; 17:29). It is not hard to see that the same imagery was applied to otherworldly punishments. According to 4 Ezra, the nations that have not obeyed the commandments of the Lord will face fire and torment (4 Ezra 7:36–38).[86] The oppressing tyrant in 4 Maccabees deserves the everlasting torment by fire (4 Macc 9:9; cf. 12:12). The sinners find their dwelling-place in fire in Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 23:6; 38:4; 44:9; 63:4). A fiery Gehenna is mentioned in several different writings, such as the *Sibylline Oracles* (2,290–305; 4,43), the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (15:6; 31:2–3), and *Joseph*

[80] Glasson, *Greek Influence*, 12,22–23; Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 217.

[81] The punishments of the sinners in the Epistle of Enoch include both facing their end at the hands of the righteous (95:3; 96:1; 98:12), which probably refers to an earthly punishment, and an otherworldly punishment (97:10; 100:4; 102:11). The sinners are both said to be destroyed (96:8; 97:1; 98:9) and to receive an eternal punishment (103:8; cf. 22:11; 27:1–2). Cf. Hengel, *Judaism 2*, 134, n. 601.

[82] See, e.g., Himmelfarb, *Tours*, 107–12.

[83] Cf., e.g., Lev 10:2; Num 11:1; 2 Kgs 1:10; Ezek 38:22; 39:6.

[84] See further below, p. 271.

[85] Isa 66:15,24; Joel 2:3; Mal 3:19; *2 Bar.* 48:39,43; 85:13; *T. Zeb.* 10:3; *Sib. Or.* 3,672–74,690; 4,171–80; *Ps. Sol.* 12:4; 15:4. Cf. 4 Ezra 13:9–11,38; *2 Bar.* 27:10; 70:8.

[86] Cf. *2. Bar.* 44:15; 59:2; 64:7.

*and Aseneth* (12:11).[87] In the description in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, Hades is a sea of fire whose waves burn sulfur and pitch (6:2). In some writings, the wicked also suffer from thirst.[88]

Thus the torment of the rich man in Hades belongs to the common imagery of pagan and Jewish descriptions concerning otherworldly punishments. On the other hand, Luke does not make use of another frequent characteristic of the place of punishment, that is, its darkness. The traditional world of the dead, both the Homeric Hades and the Jewish Sheol, was imagined as a gloomy place. Darkness later became a standard feature of the place of the wicked both in pagan and Jewish accounts. Correspondingly, the abode of the righteous was full of light.[89]

The description of the consolation of Lazarus remains more vague. It is not quite clear what his blessed existence consists of. Whatever it is, it is the opposite of his earthly life, which was characterized by hunger, disease and inadequate shelter. Even though the idea of fellowship with the righteous patriarchs was common in contemporary Jewish writings, the expression "Abraham's bosom" does not occur in them.[90] Interestingly, a fourth century B.C.E. gold leaf from Thurii includes a corresponding expression, "the bosom of the Queen of the dead."[91] The text does not reveal what this expression means but the person arriving there is called blessed (ὄλβιος) and happy (μακαριστός), a god instead of a mortal (θεὸς ἀντὶ βροτοῖο).[92]

The meaning of the expression "Abraham's bosom" has been sought by analogy in the fourth gospel where the word κόλπος occurs in two passages. In the Johannine prologue, it refers to the intimacy between the Father and the Son: "No one has ever seen God. It is God the only Son, who is in the father's bosom (ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον

[87] Aseneth prays that she will be delivered from the devil (ὁ λέων) lest he cast her into the flame of fire. The context is not explicit as to whether this means the place of punishment for the wicked but this may be assumed.

[88] "Just as the things that have been predicted will receive you, so the thirst and torment which are prepared will receive them;" 4 Ezra 8:59. Cf. *Sib. Or.* 2,305–306: "They will all gnash their teeth, wasting away with vehement thirst and violence."

[89] See, e.g., Pindar *Ol.* 2,61–62; frgs. 129,130; Aristophanes *Ran.* 155,455; Plutarch *Suav. viv.* 1105b; Virgil *Aen.* 640–41; Lucian *Luct.* 2; *1 En.* 22:3; *Ps. Sol.* 14:9; 15:10; *Apoc. Zeph.* 2:7.

[90] *T. Ab.* A 20; *bQidd.* 72a–b. See further below p. 276, n. 39.

[91] In text A 1 (vv. 5–7), the deceased declares: "I escaped from the painful cycle/I gained the victor's crown with swift feet/I fled into the bosom of the Queen of the dead (δεσποίνας δ' ὑπὸ κόλπον ἔδυν χθονίας βασιλείας)."

[92] See the whole text on p. 70.

τοῦ πατρός; [NRSV: close to the Father's heart]), who has made him known." (John 1:18). In the description of Jesus' last meal with his disciples, it is associated with a special place at the banquet: "One of his disciples—the one whom Jesus loved—was reclining next to him" (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ; John 13:23). Analogously, Lazarus' place in Abraham's bosom has been understood as either a honorary position at a heavenly banquet or a loving communion between Lazarus and Abraham.[93] Certainly, these two connotations need not be mutually exclusive.

Recently Hock has argued that the expression ". . . puts emphasis less on the honor Lazarus supposedly now enjoys than on the protection and care he at last possesses."[94] According to him, this becomes apparent from the Greek epitaphs where the word κόλπος has many parallels. For example, in one epitaph a man who has lost both his wife and his infant son asks Persephone to put the child "in the bosom" (ἐς κόλπους) of his dead mother.[95] It is evident that being in Abraham's bosom implies all kinds of positive things, including the care and protection that Lazarus did not find in his earthly life. Nevertheless, Hock's view is based on a one-sided reading of the evidence. In practically all the epigraphic examples he refers to, the word κόλπος is used in the sense of the earth covering the dead. Either they include a wish that the earth would embrace the dead person in her bosom[96] or, more frequently, simply state that now the earth covers the body in her bosom.[97] In neither case has the expression to do with the image of postmortem life.[98] In one of the examples given by Hock, the term "Abraham's bosom" is used but the epigram is late, probably from the fifth century C.E., and thus is likely to reflect the Lukan phrase instead of illuminating it.[99]

[93] Meyer, "κόλπος," 825.

[94] Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 456. Cf. Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 299. According to him, the expression denotes an intimate relationship, not a honorary banquet.

[95] *Anth. Pal.* 7,387; Hock, "Lazarus and Micyllus," 456, n. 36.

[96] E.g., *Anth. Pal.* 7,321: "Dear earth, put the old Amyntichus in your bosom . . . (Γαῖα φίλη, τὸν πρέσβυν Ἀμύντιχον ἔνθεο κόλποις)." Cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7,476.

[97] E.g., *Anth. Pal.* 7,61: "The earth hides here in her bosom the body of Plato (Γαῖα μὲν ἐν κόλποις κρύπτειν τόδε σῶμα Πλάτωνος) but the soul has an immortal station of the blest." Cf. 7,368,619; Lattimore, *Themes*, 211–212,243,304.

[98] According to Peres, the expression ἐν κόλποις εἶναι might imply the divinity of earth; the dead rest in the bosom of the goddess Mother Earth; *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 74.

[99] Lattimore, *Themes*, 302. The expression in the epigraph was undoubtedly

Moreover, among the dozens of epitaphs of dead children cited by Lattimore, the case Hock gives as an example is the only one where the word κόλπος occurs. It is hardly a technical term denoting parental protection and care.

However, the banquet imagery is well attested in several descriptions of the blessed fate of the righteous and it is probably in this image where the emphasis also lies in the Lukan account. First, Luke also uses it in other passages in an eschatological context. In the passage concerning salvation (quoted above on p. 206) Jesus declares how people come "... from east and west, from north and south, and will eat (ἀνακλιθήσονται) in the kingdom of God" with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets (Lk 13:28–29). Similarly, the parable of the Great Supper, itself a metaphor of a heavenly feast, begins with an exclamation: "Blessed is anyone who will eat bread in the kingdom of God" (Lk 14:15–24).[100] At the last supper, Jesus promises his disciples that they will eat and drink in his table in the kingdom of God (Lk 22:29–30). Thus the "kingdom of God" for Luke is eating and drinking in the company of other righteous ones.[101] Such concrete images might have originally referred to an earthly kingdom[102] but the Lukan context (especially in chapter 13) more likely suggests an otherworldly kingdom, at least a blessed postmortem feast.[103]

In many pagan accounts, the goal of the just is to be with the gods, and often this communion is described as a banquet (συμπόσιον).[104] A reference to a symposium as the form of the blessed existence occurs, for example, in the so-called Pelinna gold leaf where the deceased is promised: "You have wine as your fortunate honor; and below the earth, there are ready for you the same prizes (τέλεα)

formulated after the Lukan expression: ψυχὴ δ' αὐτοῖο ἵν' ἀθάνατος [Θ]εὸς ἔστιν· 'Αβραμίοις κόλποις ἀναπαύε[τ]ε ὡς μακάρων τις.

[100] Cf. 6:21 where Jesus promises that those who hunger now, will be fed.

[101] This is, of course, in striking contrast with Paul's words: "For the kingdom of God is not eating nor drinking but peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17).

[102] Thus, e.g., E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus*, 172–73.

[103] The banquet imagery fits well the overall Lukan usage of the motif of table-fellowship in his story of Jesus. See Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," 624–27.

[104] Graf, *Eleusis*, 98–103. A banquet imagery also occurs in the twelfth tablet of the *Gilgamesh Epic*; Segal, *Life after Death*, 91.

as for the other blessed ones."[105] In the *Republic*, Plato refers to the teaching of "Musaeus and his son" according to which the just will participate in a "symposium of the saints" (συμπόσιον τῶν ὁσίων) in "everlasting drunkenness" (μέθην αἰώνιον; *Resp.* 2,363c–e).[106] Similarly, according to Pseudo-Plato, the good souls will attend ". . . well-arranged drinking-parties and self-furnished feasts" (συμπόσια εὐμελῆ καὶ εἰλαπίναι αὐτοχορήγητοι; *Ax.* 371d). Virgil speaks of feasts on the grass (*per herbam vescentis laetumque; Aen.* 6,656–57). Lucian uses the term "the banquet of the blessed" (τὸ τῶν μακάρων συμπόσιον; *Ver. hist.* 2,11; cf. 5; 7; 14; 25). According to Dio Chrysostom, the king of the gods invites people to a ". . . most splendid feast and banquet" (ἐπ' εὐωχίαν τινὰ καὶ θοίνην λαμπράν; *Charid.* 29). The same image also appears in the epitaphs.[107] Many Greco-Roman tomb reliefs depict a *Totenmahl*, a death feast, which probably shows an afterlife scene.[108]

Banquet imagery also occurs in some Jewish texts, even though not very frequently and not very explicitly. In the Similitudes of Enoch, "the Lord of Spirits" will remain over the righteous and elect ones and ". . . they will dwell, and eat, and lie down, and rise up for ever and ever" with the Son of Man (*1 En.* 62:14).[109] In *2 Enoch*, the righteous are also said to arrive in paradise with Adam and the ancestors and they are ". . . filled with joy; just as a person invites his best friends to have dinner with him and they arrive with joy, and they talk together in front of that man's palace, waiting with joyful anticipation to have dinner with delightful enjoyments and riches that cannot be measured, and joy and happiness in eternal light and life" (*2 En.* 42:5).[110] In the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, the righteous will neither hunger nor thirst (*Apoc. El.* 1:10; 3:61).[111] These

[105] Graf, "Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology," 241–42, 246. The word τέλη is ambiguous as it might also refer to rituals.

[106] Cf. above p. 79.

[107] Lattimore, *Themes*, 52 and note 220; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 234–35.

[108] Garland, *Greek Way*, 70. The earliest such relief is dated ca. 400 B.C.E.

[109] Translation by Knibb.

[110] This is the long recension (labeled J); trans. by Andersen in *OTP 1*, 168. *2 Enoch* bristles with textual problems and it is very hard to judge how the different recensions relate to each other or the supposed original of the work.

[111] In the latter passage, the Akhmimic version omits the words "hunger nor." It is hard to evaluate the evidence of this passage since the extant writing is probably Christian in origin or at least thoroughly Christianized. Some scholars think it is based on an earlier Jewish original; see Rosenstiehl, *L'apocalypse d'Élie*, 75–76. He dates the original to the first century B.C.E. For a different opinion, see Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity*, 13–20.

expressions may reflect Greek banquet imagery but they are also well-rooted in the Hebrew Bible conviction that the righteous do not lack food or drink (cf. Deut 28:11; Isa 33:15–16; 49:10). This image was broadened into an abundant eschatological paradise where

> . . . the earth will also yield fruits ten thousandfold. And on one vine will be a thousand branches, and one branch will produce a thousand clusters, and one cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and one grape will produce a cor of wine. And those who are hungry will enjoy themselves and they will, moreover, see marvels every day (*2 Bar.* 29:5–6).[112]

The Lukan account also makes clear that Lazarus has access to refreshing water, something the rich man lacks and desires in his fiery agony. This image is also a frequent one in different otherworldly accounts.[113] Water is needed since the dead are thirsty. This is also confirmed by funerary finds; cups are common objects among grave offerings.[114] A spring of water in the otherworld is associated with memory and oblivion in the gold leaves. According to text B 10, there are two springs in the otherworld.[115] The first one is situated under a white cypress[116] and there the apparently thirsty souls refresh themselves (ψύχονται; cf. the request of the rich man to have Lazarus refresh him: καταψύχονται; v. 24).[117] However, drinking water from the spring brings oblivion and there is a danger that the blessed souls, who are likewise "dry with thirst and perishing," will also drink from it. That is why the gold leaf warns them not to even go near that spring but, despite their thirst, proceed further to another spring, where cool water flows from the Lake of Memory, and drink only from it. This spring is guarded and the deceased must know the right words in order to be allowed to drink from it. Water, thirst and oblivion also occur in Plato's description (*Resp.* 10,621). The souls who are entering new bodies must drink from the River of Oblivion. To reach it, the souls must journey through a burning and

[112] Translation by Klijn in *OTP 1*, 630. Cf. *1 En.* 10:19.
[113] Some see Egyptian influence here but even though there are Egyptian analogies, according to Zuntz (*Persephone*, 371–76), they are not very convincing. The theme "thirst of the dead" is not restricted to Greece and Egypt but appears also in, e.g., Mesopotamian texts; see Bottéro, "Mythologie," 32.
[114] Kurtz & Broadman, *Greek Burial Customs*, 209.
[115] See the text on p. 71.
[116] A tree in the otherworld also occurs in many cultures, e.g., the tree of life by the river of the water of life in Rev. 22:1; Zuntz, *Persephone*, 386. Cf. also *1 En.* 24:4–6; 25:4–5; 26:1–2; 28:1–3; 30:1–3; 32:3–5.
[117] The same phrase also occurs in text B 11.

terrible stifling heat, obviously to ensure that all the souls are too thirsty to abstain from drinking. References to refreshing water also occur in epitaphs[118] and fountains of pure water at the abode of the blessed dead appear in some literary accounts.[119] The most obvious example of the water imagery in a Jewish text is in the description of the waiting places of the dead in *1 Enoch* 22 where the place of the righteous is distinguished from the other places by the luminous spring of water.[120]

The vagueness of the description of Lazarus' place in Abraham's bosom allows all kinds of positive connotations. One way of describing the blessed state of the righteous after death in many Jewish writings is to call it "peace" and "rest."[121] For example, in 4 Ezra and *2 Baruch*, the souls of the righteous are gathered into chambers to wait for the future judgment while at rest. Correspondingly, the souls of the unrighteous must wander around without enjoying rest (4 Ezra 7:78–99 [see pp. 139–40 above]; *2 Bar.* 30:2–5). The rest of the righteous is a frequent image in such writings as Pseudo-Philo and the Hellenistic novel *Joseph and Aseneth*. For example, Moses enjoys rest (*requies*) until God visits the earth and raises him and the fathers of Israel from the earth in which they sleep, and they come together and dwell in an immortal habitation (*L.A.B.* 19:12). The same idea is expanded to include all the souls of the righteous in Israel: they will be taken and laid up in peace (*in pace*) until the time of the world is fulfilled, and God restores them to their fathers, and their fathers to them (*L.A.B.* 23:13).[122] Aseneth, the Egyptian wife of Joseph, is expected to have ". . . her resting place in the highest heaven (τὸν τόπον τῆς καταπαύσεως αὐτῆς ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις)" that God has prepared for his elect ones (*Jos. Asen.* 23:8; cf. 8:9). Rest for the righteous is also mentioned in *2 Enoch* (*2 En.* 42:3 [J]).[123]

---

[118] Lattimore, *Themes*, 67.
[119] E.g., Ps-Plato *Ax.* 371c; Virgil, *Aen.* 6,636,659,673–75.
[120] See the text on pp. 130–32. Cf. Wacker, *Weltordnung*, 232–33.
[121] The acclamation *in pace*/ἐν εἰρήνῃ became favorite expressions in early Christian epitaphs. They were so frequently used that they "became nearly an identifying mark for Christian burials;" Snyder, *Ante Pacem: Archeological Evidence of Church Life before Constantine*, 128.
[122] Cf. *L.A.B.* 28:10 that also speaks of the "rest of the righteous" (*requies iustorum*) when they are dead.
[123] Recension A describes the abode of the righteous as "a blessed place" where "all live in joy and in gladness and in an immeasurable light and in eternal life."

In the description of the rest of the righteous and the restlessness or "confusion" (4 Ezra 7:93) of the unrighteous in 4 Ezra, both kinds of souls have a sevenfold reward or punishment (see the text above pp. 139–40). These also have affinities with the fate of the rich man and Lazarus. Like the righteous in 4 Ezra, Lazarus also enjoys rest with angels, has been set free from the tribulations of his earthly life, and may see the torments of the rich man. And like the unrighteous in 4 Ezra, the rich man suffers because he has despised the law of God in his life, has not repented, and can see the reward of the righteous. Seeing the rewards of the righteous or the punishments of the wicked is also a part of the otherworldly vindication and retribution in other Jewish texts (cf. *1 En.* 102:8; *2 Bar.* 51:5–6). This kind of malicious pleasure can be problematic to present-day readers but it was extremely common in early Jewish and Christian apocalyptic visions.[124] Behind it is probably the idea of the righteous rejoicing over the fall of their enemies, apparent in many Psalms.[125] Additionally, in *Jubilees*, the righteous see and rejoice over the judgment and curse that falls upon their enemies (*Jub.* 23:30–31).[126] This punishment takes place on earth but is easily later translated into the otherworld.

This theme is also in the Lukan description; in Hades the rich man ". . . sees Abraham afar and Lazarus in his bosom" (v. 23). No further point is made of this sight, however. The emphasis is shifted to the dialogue and the impossibility of changing the conditions. Even though the rich man and Lazarus can see each other, there is a great chasm between them to prevent any traffic from one place to the other.

---

[124] A good example is Tertullian *De Spectac.* 30. There he envisions the last judgment and rejoices as he sees how persecutors of Christians are being tormented "in fires more fierce than those with which in the days of their pride they raged against the followers of Christ." Other tormented ones include philosophers and other representatives of the pagan culture, such as poets, playwrights, actors, charioteers, and wrestlers. Tertullian's malice was by no way exceptional; see Roig Lanzillotta, "Does Punishment Reward the Righteous: The Justice Pattern Underlying the Apocalypse of Peter," 130–31.

[125] E.g., Pss 52:7–9; 54:9; 58:11; 59:11; 91:8; 92:12.

[126] The text is cited in n. 107 on p. 137; cf. *1 En.* 56:8 and 62:11–12. In *T. Mos.* (10:10), the exalted Israel sees her enemies on earth (*in terram*) and rejoices in seeing them. The phrase *in terram* (equivalent to the Hebrew בָּאָרֶץ) has sometimes been interpreted as Gehenna, which would make the passage equal with the description in 4 Ezra. This kind of interpretation is not very credible and it is not necessary, either. The point in the passage is the juxtaposition of those up high and down below and seeing and recognition.

## 11.4. The Separating Chasm

A great chasm separates the abodes of the rich man and Lazarus, as indicated in Abraham's words: "Besides all this, there is a great chasm fixed between you and us, so that those who are willing to pass from here to you cannot, nor can they cross from there to us" (v. 26). The insurmountable chasm is an important part of the reversal story. It strengthens and underlines the moral of the example story and thus it is an essential element in the otherworldly scene. Yet, it is interesting to notice that a chasm in the otherworld occurs frequently in both pagan and Jewish accounts. In many of them, the underworld is full of chasms, bars, gates, ropes and snares.[127] Their most important function is to prevent the dead from escaping.[128] In the Homeric epics, the unbridgeable barrier between the world of the dead and the world of the living is formed by the underworld rivers but, as early as in Hesiod, this barrier is described as a "vast chasm" (χάσμα μέγ'[α]; *Theog.* 740).[129] Another early reference to a chasm that separates different worlds is in a fragment of Parmenides[130] where the gates of the paths of night and day open into a wide chasm (χάσμ' ἀχανές; 1,18). The poet enters through it to meet a goddess who instructs him about life and truth. In Euripides' play the *Phoenician Women*, Oedipus speaks of the bottomless chasms (ἄβυσσα χάσματα) of Tartarus (*Phoin.* 1604–605).

Plato also uses the word χάσμα in his description of Hades (*Resp.* 10,614c–d) but there the chasm has no separating function. The rendering of the word is not a gulf or pit but an opening. In the otherworldly meadow, Er sees two openings (δυ' εἶναι χάσματα) near to each other and above them, two more in heavens. According to the verdicts of the judges sitting between these chasms, the righteous ascend to the heavens where they enter through one of the openings

[127] Schmidt, "Memory as Immortality," 89.

[128] Cf. above n. 13 on p. 58 and n. 103 on p. 74. These did not, however, stop the temporary visits of the dead to the world of the living; see the discussion above in chap. 10.2.

[129] This seems to be the earliest occurrence of the word in literature—irrespective of the fact that lines 740–45 are usually considered as a later interpolation; West, *Hesiod's Theogony*, 358, 364.

[130] This pre-Socratic philosopher of Elea lived in the early fifth century B.C.E. and influenced many subsequent philosophers, e.g., Plato. Unfortunately only a few fragments of his work are known and his life also remains obscure. Cf. Gallop, *Parmenides*, 3–6.

in heaven and the ungodly descend through one of the openings on earth (τὸ χάσμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ τῆς γῆς). From the other earthly opening, souls that are dirty and greasy all over ascend back to the meadow from their underworld punishments, and from the other heavenly opening clean souls descend after their heavenly tour.

There are several chasms with several functions in Plutarch's hereafter. On his otherworldly visit, Thespesius sees a great chasm (χάσμα μέγα) in the place of Lethe (*Sera* 565e–566b). It has an appearance of a Bacchic grotto with soft and gentle breezes, beautiful flowers and sweet fragrances. It represents the pleasures of the body which cause the soul to lose its lightness and draws the soul toward rebirth.[131] Far away from there, he is taken to another deep chasm (χάσμα βαθύ) into which streams of different colors flow. It is a source ". . . from which dreams derive and disseminate the unadorned and true, commingled, as you see, with the colorful and deceptive" and the place for the oracle of Apollo (*Sera* 566b–e). In another myth, a great chasm (χάσμα μέγα) functions as a place of punishment. It is fiery, most terrible and deep, and from it could be heard ". . . innumerable roars and groans of animals, the wailing of innumerable babes, the mingled lamentations of men and women, and noise and uproar of every kind, coming faintly from far down in the depths" (*Gen. Socr.* 590f).[132]

In the accounts of Lucian, a chasm again serves as an impassable barrier between the earth and the low realms of the underworld.[133] At the same time, it serves as an entrance to Hades. A certain Cleodemes is led to Hades through a chasm (διὰ τινος χάσματος εἰς τὸν Ἅιδην; *Philops.* 25). Similarly, another visitor, Menippus, enters Hades through a chasm (διὰ τοῦ χάσματα; *Men.* 10) and Socrates is said to be terrified when he looks through the chasm into Hades (*Dial. mort.* 4).

Thus a chasm is a typical feature of pagan descriptions of the otherworld, even though several meanings are attached to the word. Some Jewish accounts also share this feature. This may well be adapted from Greek underworld imagery. For example, a chasm

[131] Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament: Religiongeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen*, 82, n. 4; Culianu, *Psychanodia*, 114–15.
[132] Cf. *Superst.* 167a.
[133] According to *Charon* 22, that is why gifts for the dead are unnecessary; see Cole, "Charon's Obol," 222.

serves as a place of punishment for the fallen stars in the otherworldly vision of Enoch:

> And I saw a burning fire. And beyond those mountains is a place beyond the great earth where the heavens are completed. And I saw a great chasm (χάσμα μέγα) with descending pillars of fire, immeasurable in depth and height. And on the top of that chasm I saw a place where there was no heavenly firmament above, nor earth as foundation beneath it, nor water under it, nor birds. It was a desolate and dreadful place (*1 En.* 18:9–12).

The insurmountable chasm between the rich man and Lazarus in Luke's description is thus firmly rooted in the overall otherworldly imagery of his time. What is different in Luke's use of the image is that the chasm separates not the world of the dead from that of the living but the different areas in the world of the dead. The separation of the blessed and the tormented ones and the impossibility of bridging the gulf between the two are part of the heart of the moral of Luke's story. It makes the finality of the reversal concrete.

## 11.5. Bodily existence

The torments of the rich man are described in a very concrete manner, as shown in his request: "Father Abraham, have mercy on me and send Lazarus here so that he would dip the tip of his finger in water to refresh my tongue for I am in pain in this flame" (v. 24). How should such concrete bodily terms be understood? The apparent corporeality has often embarrassed scholars, especially the earlier commentators.[134] Such embarrassment reflects an anachronistic dichotomy between body and soul, material and immaterial, as Dale Martin has extensively argued.[135] The ancient philosophers held a different view: the soul was made of matter, such as fire, ether or

[134] See Plummer, *S. Luke*, 39; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 613.

[135] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 6–15. Such dichotomy still occurs in present-day scholarship. For example, Brenk speaks of "the immateriality of the soul" which becomes an obstacle to the traditional description of the underworld; *In Mist Apparelled*, 23. Similarly, in his discussion of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Green states that the "notion of the disembodied soul must be read into the story since the characters in Hades act as human agents with corporeal existence;" "'Bodies—That Is, Human Lives': A Re-Examination of Human Nature in the Bible," 168. However, even though the souls bear bodily features, the ancients would not call their postmortem life "corporeal existence," see further below.

atoms. This, however, did not mean that they thought the soul was corporeal, for "material" did not mean the same as "corporeal" and "immaterial" did not equal "incorporeal". The soul was different from the body and thus incorporeal, yet it occupied space and was material. Even Plato, who makes a sharp distinction between body and soul, does not understand them as representing different realms (such as physical and spiritual or material and immaterial) but as different parts of one spectrum.[136]

Moreover, the word σῶμα was not used only for flesh but also, e.g., for celestial bodies. Thus, when Paul speaks about the resurrection body (1 Cor 15:35–55) he does not envision a resuscitation of a corpse but a totally new body which is material (like all bodies are) but not corporeal.[137] According to Paul, the new body does not resemble the present one; their relationship is similar to the one between a seed and a plant. One metaphor Paul uses for this new body is a star (vv. 40–41). It is likely, then, that Paul's idea of a resurrection body was not far from the popular Hellenistic concepts of astral immortality. Certainly it could not resemble the present body as "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (v. 50).

This does not mean, however, that the ancients made no distinction between body and soul.[138] A body was a body and did not survive death in any form like most philosophers would claim the soul did. The souls in the hereafter were incorporeal since their bodies were in graves. Yet, as they were thought to be material, they could be described in bodily terms. In this manner, soul and body were never totally separated. The only way in which the visitors to the realm of the dead could tell the dead apart was if souls had a physical form. Ghosts also appeared in physical, easily recognizable form. Moreover, dead bodies might be mutilated, either in order to create dishonor for them in the world to come—where they appeared in the same form in which they died—or to disable them from disturbing the living—since the physically mutilated body made for a weaker ghost—or for both reasons.[139]

---

[136] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 11–12.
[137] See Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 123–29.
[138] Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 115–16; Long, "Soul and Body," 41–45, 52–53.
[139] Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 156–59.

The soul of the deceased was sometimes described as an εἴδωλον or image which resembled the person while alive.[140] For example, in the Homeric description the ψυχή of the dead Patroclus visits Achilles in a dream ". . . all in his likeness for stature, and the lovely eyes and voice" (*Il.* 23,66–67). Despite this, he is only an insubstantial phantom, which becomes clear when Achilles tries to embrace him (*Il.* 23,99–101).[141] Similarly, Odysseus tries three times in vain to embrace the soul of his dead mother who flies from him "like a shadow or rather a dream" (*Od.* 11,204–208). When Odysseus complains that this is a trick by Persephone, his mother answers: "This is the way of mortals when one dies: the muscles no longer hold the flesh and bones but the strong might of the blazing fire overcomes them, as soon as life leaves the white bones, and the spirit takes flight, flying off like a dream" (*Od.* 11,218–223). Centuries later, Virgil imitated Homer in this respect. Also Aeneas strives three times to throw his arms around his father, whose soul flees from his hands like ". . . a wisp of wind or the wings of a fleeting dream" (*Aen.* 6,700–702). Even later, Lucian parodies this belief in his *True Story 2*. There he describes his fantastic adventure that takes him to the Isle of the Blessed. According to the story, the dead there do not differ from the living visitors who eat the same food, drink the same wine and participate in all the activities of the dead. The only difference is that, if someone touched the dead, one would realize that they did not have a body, even though they looked exactly like they had (*Ver. hist.* 2,12).

The impalpable, incorporeal souls also have corporeal qualities in other Homeric passages. Even though the bodies of the dead are explicitly said to have been burnt and the dead in Hades are mere shades, the souls are able to drink blood.[142] The souls also bear the wounds suffered in battles. Thus Hector carries the wounds he

[140] A similar concept is found in Mesopotamian sources, see, e.g., Lapinkivi, *Sumerian Sacred Marriage*, 139–40.

[141] Achilles realizes that what he saw was "ψυχή and εἴδωλον." According to Bremmer, the ψυχή represents the identity of the deceased, the εἴδωλον his or her appearance which does not differ from their appearance while alive; *Early Greek Concept*, 76–79. The distinction is not, however, clearcut, cf., e.g., *Il.* 23,72; *Od.* 11,476; 24,14 where the term εἴδωλον is used.

[142] Odysseus comes into contact with the deceased by letting them drink the blood of his sacrificial animals; *Od.* 11,98–99.

received from Achilles and others.[143] In the same way, the eternally punished figures suffer real pain. The shade of Tityus feels the vultures tear his liver, and Tantalus suffers from real hunger and thirst.[144] Interestingly, the actual pain felt by these mythical figures was called into question and ridiculed by many ancient writers. For example, the Pyrrhonist skeptic Sextus Empiricus calls them tales (μυθεύομενα) that should be treated as such. If, he asks, Tityus was lifeless (ἄψυχος) and thus without any consciousness (οὐδεμίαν συναίσθησιν ἔχων) how could he suffer such punishment? Or if he did have life (ψυχή) how could he be dead? Similarly, if Tantalus did not get any food or drink how could he survive? If he was immortal how come he was in such a state? Immortal nature, he concludes, fights against pain and torment (μάχεται γὰρ ἀθάνατος φύσις ἀλγηδόσι καὶ βασάνοις) since everything that suffers pain is mortal (*Adv. phys.* 1,66–70). Lucretius understood the descriptions of physical torments as allegories representing the fears and agonies of this life (*De rerum* 3,978–1023).[145] Plutarch argues that the Homeric punishments are impossible—vultures cannot tear the livers of the wicked nor heavy burdens crush their bodies—since the body has been consumed by fire or has rotted away (*Lat. viv.* 1130c–e).[146] And once again, Lucian makes fun of the sufferings of Tantalus. In the *Dialogues of the Dead*, Menippus, who is visiting Hades, encounters Tantalus crying because of his thirst. Menippus asks him why he needs to drink if he no longer has a body. He reminds him that his body that could feel hunger and thirst is buried in Lydia and he is just a ψυχή. Tantalus answers that that is exactly his punishment—his soul is thirsty as if it were a body (*Dial. mort.* 7).

Plato also makes it clear that it is only the souls who are judged. In the myth of the *Gorgias*, this is essential in order that the magnificence of the bodies (noble appearance, etc.) would not lead the judges astray. This happened at the beginning of time when living people judged other living. To avoid wrong verdicts and to guarantee just sentences, Zeus changed the practice so that the judgment takes place after death and only the souls are judged (*Gorg.* 523b–524a). The

---

[143] Cf. Riley, *Resurrection*, 50–51.
[144] Sourvinou-Inwood, "Crime and Punishment," 38, n. 9.
[145] Cf. p. 85 above.
[146] That is why, according to Plutarch, the real punishment of the wicked is oblivion and obscurity; cf. above pp. 94–96.

souls that come to the judgment bear corporeal features. In the same way as the imprints of life, such as scars from fighting, are visible on dead bodies, the marks of different actions in life are visible on the souls of the dead. For instance, the soul of the Great King and other evil rulers are stigmatized and scarred by perjury and injustice, the stains of license and luxury. When the judge Rhadamanthys sees them, he sends the souls to receive their well-deserved punishments (*Gorg.* 524c–525a). This image becomes the object of scorn in Lucian's hands. According to the dialogue between Rhadamanthys and the dead in the *Cataplus*, there are invisible marks on the soul for every wicked deed done on earth. However, in order to see them, Rhadamanthys orders the dead to strip themselves naked (*Catapl.* 24–26).

Physical qualities of the dead souls occur also in Jewish accounts. Perhaps the most explicit reference is in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*. Zephaniah observes that some of the tormented ones have hair and bodies. His angelic guide gives no other explanation for the sight than: "The Lord gives them bodies and hair to them as he desires" (*Apoc. Zeph.* 10:12–14).[147] Even though the corporeal images are not as apparent in other writings, the actual punishments, such as scourging or burning imply physicality.

The idea of the bodily appearance of the souls reflects a widespread popular belief according to which the incorporeal dead are able to eat, drink and communicate with the living.[148] This becomes evident from a quotation from Cicero:

> Though they knew that the bodies of the dead were consumed with fire, yet they imagined that events took place in the lower world which cannot take place and are not intelligible without bodies; the reason was that they were unable to grasp the conception of souls living an independent life and tried to find for them some sort of appearance and shape (*Tusc.* 1,16,37).[149]

[147] The passage has a close affinity with 1 Cor 15:38 where Paul, discussing the resurrection body, declares: "But God gives it a body as he has desired, and to each kind of seed its own body." This might be a sign of a Christian redaction of *Apoc. Zeph.*

[148] Riley, *Resurrection*, 47. That is why funerary sacrifices had an important place in popular religious practices.

[149] Translation by King. Cf. Milikowski, "Which Gehenna? Retribution and Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels and in Early Jewish Texts," 248, n. 23.

However, this is not the belief of only uneducated people. For example, Virgil describes both the otherworldly torments and bliss in a very real, "corporeal" fashion. The tormented are scourged and drag their chains while the blessed dead do sports, wrestle and dance while some have their weapons, chariots and horses (*Aen.* 6,557–58. 642–55).[150]

The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus reflects a similar view. Even though they are incorporeal, Lazarus apparently enjoys a heavenly banquet[151] while the rich man in his agony wishes for just a drop of water to cool his tongue. The finger of Lazarus and the tongue of the rich man do not denote real corporeality[152] but the mentioning of bodily parts makes the story alive and more immediate. The hearer understands how horrible the pains of the rich man must have been when only a drop of water on his tongue from the fingertip of Lazarus would refresh him.

All in all, it was necessary to imagine the dead as somehow preserving their former external appearance so that they could be recognized both by the living and the other dead. In Plutarch's description, for example, Thespesius can recognize his acquaintances and has no difficulties in telling who among the tormented ones is his own father (*Sera* 564a; 566e–567d). The father is depicted with limbs: he stretches his arms marked with scars and wounds towards his son. The description also gives a reason why the dead must be recognizable. It is because those ungodly who have not received a due punishment on earth will receive an even harder one in the otherworld and the dead may see the punishments of their wicked ancestors (cf. 565b). Yet the dead differ from the living. The souls neither cast a shadow nor blink their eyes—as Thespesius, a living visitor, does (564c–d). The appearance of the dead is also somehow changed to reflect the conduct of their lives. Some are shining like the moon at her clearest, others bear bruises, black tattoos and scratches (564d–e).

Other pagan accounts speak of the recognizable appearance of the dead despite the changes caused by death. For example, in a poem of Propertius dating from the first century C.E., the poet envi-

[150] Cf. Riley, *Resurrection*, 55–58.

[151] See the discussion above on pp. 216–18.

[152] *Contra* Peres according to whom the story reflects "a Jewish monistic anthropology;" *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 188–89.

sions the return of his dead[153] love, Cynthia. According to the description, she has the same looks, the same eyes and hair as when she was carried to her grave and she is able to breathe and speak. Yet her clothing bears marks of fire, the water of Lethe has withered her lips and the bones in her brittle hands rattle (*Elegy* 4,7).[154] Lucian, as usual, makes fun of the recognition of the dead. Menippus can recognize the recently dead but others are ". . . ancient and moldy, and as Homer says 'impalpable' (ἀμενηνούς) while others were still fresh and compact, particularly the Egyptians, because of the durability of their mummification" (*Men.* 15). That is why it is not easy to tell the dead apart because everybody becomes the same when their bones are bare; they are ". . . undefined, unlabeled, and unable ever again to be distinguished by anyone (ἄδηλα καὶ ἀνεπίγραφα καὶ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἔτι διακρίνεσθαι δυνάμενα)" (*Men.* 15). In his other descriptions, the dead are dry skulls (τὰ κρανία ξηρήτατα) who cannot eat and drink (*Charon* 22; *Dial. mort.* 5, 6, 28, 29).

In Luke's example story, it is essential that the rich man recognizes Lazarus as being his poor neighbor on earth. This is one of the most significant differences between the example story and the Gressmann parallel, the Demotic tale of Setne. In the Demotic tale, the rich man and poor man just happened to die on the same day but having had no interaction during their earthly lives or in the realm of the dead.[155] The theme of recognition is also essential in many Jewish accounts. For example, in *2 Baruch*, the corporeal resurrection is explicitly justified by the fact that the righteous and the ungodly must be able to recognize each other:

> For the earth will surely give back the dead at that time; it receives them now in order to keep them, not changing anything in their form. But as it has received them so it will give them back. And as I have delivered them to it so it will raise them. For then it will be necessary to show those who live that the dead are living again, and that those who went away have come back. And it will be that when they have recognized each other, those who know each other at this moment,

[153] Many commentators assume that the real Cynthia is not yet dead but the poet only imagines what it would be like if she were dead and returned.

[154] "She had the selfsame hair and eyes as on/Her bier, her shroud was burned into her side,/The fire had gnawed at her favorite beryl ring,/And Lethe's water had wasted away her lips./She breathed out living passion, and spoke,/Yet her brittle hands rattled their thumb-bones" (trans. by Shepherd).

[155] Cf. above pp. 35–36.

> then my judgment will be strong, and those things which I have been spoken of before will come (*2 Bar.* 50:2–4).[156]

Thus, the bodily appearance of the dead is necessary so that the living may understand that the resurrection is true. After the recognition, the appearance of the dead changes: the sinners become even more horrible-looking, but the righteous are glorified in the glory of the angels:

> And it will happen after this day which he appointed is over that both the shape of those who are found guilty as also the glory of those who have proved to be righteous will be changed. For the shape of those who now act wickedly will be made more evil than it is (now) so that they shall suffer torment. Also, as for the glory of those who proved to be righteous on account of my law, those who possessed intelligence in their life, and those who planted the root of wisdom in their heart—their splendor will then be glorified by transformations, and the shape of their face will be changed into the light of their beauty so that they may acquire and receive the undying world which is promised to them. Therefore, especially they who will then come will be sad, because they despised my law and stopped their ears lest they hear wisdom and receive intelligence. When they, therefore, will see those over whom they are exalted now will then be more exalted and glorified than they, then both these and those will be changed, these into the splendor of angels and those into startling visions and horrible shapes; and they will waste away even more. For they will first see and then they will go away to be tormented (*2 Bar.* 51:1–6).[157]

The recognition is important in Luke's story both because of the other dead and because of the living. If the rich man did not recognize Lazarus (and vice versa) there would be no proof for the reversal. Similarly, there would be no point for the dead Lazarus visiting the rich man's brothers if they could not tell who he is. Recognition is possible only if the dead resemble themselves while they were alive and thus the dead must be depicted having physical features. In this way, the body-like existence in the otherworld is necessary for both the central themes of Luke's example story, the reversal and the message from the world of the dead.

---

[156] All quotations from *2 Baruch* are according to Klijn in *OTP 1*. Cf. *L.A.B.* 62:9 where Jonathan swears to David: "If death separates us I know that our spirits will recognize each other."

[157] Transformation into an angelic state is one of the prominent features in most ascent apocalypses; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 47–71. The angelomorphic appearance of the righteous both in this life and in the life to come also appear in Qumran documents and many other Jewish texts; cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 109–215.

CHAPTER TWELVE

# SUMMARY OF PART THREE

In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, no explicit reason is given for the reversal. The men are not characterized as wicked and pious, only rich and poor. The lack of any explanation for the fate of the men appears even stronger if the story is divided into two, as often done. However, when the story is understood as a whole, the wickedness of the rich man becomes evident. He did not listen to "Moses and the prophets;" he did not repent which would have meant sharing his wealth with his poor neighbor.

The afterlife scene with its description of the torments of the rich man, the good lot of Lazarus, and the permanence of both fates serves Luke's rhetoric of repentance. The exhortation to repent is aimed at those who resemble the rich man's brothers. If they do not repent and show it by the proper use of their worldly wealth, their destiny will be torment in Hades with the rich man. At the same time, the story functions as a consoling assurance for the poor. The eschatological reward will be theirs. In its context, the story also bears polemical overtones against those Jews who reject Jesus, represented by the Pharisees.

The story is built around two structural themes; the one is the reversal, the other the possibility of learning about otherworldly conditions. Both these themes are used frequently in ancient literature even though the scholarly tradition on Luke's story has almost entirely concentrated on the theme of reversal alone. Some kind of a reversal takes place in many afterlife accounts that involve judgment. Often the judgment brings about a surprise: those who were powerful and mighty on earth turn out to be wicked and deserve to be punished.

The reversal of fates between rich and poor also occurs in some writings. It is a favorite theme in many satires of Lucian of Samosata. Death means deprivation of earthly luxury for the rich but freedom from earthly misery for the poor. In contrast to Luke's account, Lucian's poor are not especially rewarded but they find death a relief. The rich are tortured for their misdeeds but the worst punishment

of all is the remembrance of all the things they have lost. Death in Lucian, then, is more of an equalizer than a compensator.

Another writing where an eschatological reversal of rich and poor plays a prominent role is the Epistle of Enoch, the last chapters of *1 Enoch*. The writing describes a fierce struggle between the sinners and the righteous who are also characterized as rich and poor. The writer threatens the former with punishment and promises eternal bliss for the latter. The contrast between these groups and their eschatological fates closely resemble Luke's story. Yet, there are also differences between the two. The groups in *1 Enoch* are primarily the righteous and sinners. The sinners are rich and mighty but the righteous are never explicitly called poor. On the other hand, Luke does not call the rich man a sinner (or Lazarus pious, for that matter). This is due to the fact that Luke understands the term "sinner" differently from "Enoch." For Luke, a sinner is an object of God's mercy; someone who understands that (s)he needs to repent. The rich man of the story does not understand this and thus cannot be called a sinner.

The fate after death is permanent and cannot be changed in the otherworld. It is only after death that the rich man realizes that he failed to obey God's will but it is too late for him to repent. Appealing to Abraham does not help him nor can he intercede for his brothers. All these ideas have counterparts in Jewish writings, such as *1 Enoch*, 4 Ezra, Pseudo-Philo, and the *Testament of Abraham*.

The other structural theme of the story, the possibility of receiving a message from the world of the dead, is an even more frequently used narrative motif. The message may be acquired by two different means: either by an otherworldly journey or by an appearance of a visitor from the dead. Both the otherworldly journeys and the visiting ghosts are universal phenomena. Luke's story makes use of the latter motif which makes the Egyptian parallel story of Setne and Si-Osire, a prime example of an otherworldly journey, actually a quite remote parallel in this respect. It is not clear whether it is requested that Lazarus make a temporary visit or return back to life. The former is the more likely alternative but the verb "resurrect" does not fit the idea.

Of all the ancient stories depicting an appearance of a visitor from the dead, perhaps the one with closest affinities to Luke's story is the *Story of Jannes and Jambres*. It tells of a dead man appearing to his living brother and describing otherworldly conditions. Despite the

similarities the story shares with Luke's account, there are also many differences. In Luke's story, it is not the rich man who would appear to his brothers but their poor neighbor. Jambres performs a necromantic act in order to receive the message, a feature missing from Luke. Moreover, the fragmentary text does not allow knowledge of whether the otherworldly punishments that Jannes describes serve as a threat to his brother. Be that as it may, the *Story of Jannes and Jambres* shows that the narrative motif of revealing the otherworldly affairs through a messenger from the dead was in common use.

In addition to the structural themes, many details of Luke's description also fit well into the contemporary Hellenistic intertextual milieu. One of these is the idea of escorting angels who take Lazarus to Abraham's bosom. Souls have escorts in several pagan descriptions. As early as the last book of the *Odyssey*, Hermes functions as the escort of the dead in the netherworld. In later times, Hermes as a psychopomp becomes commonplace. Sometimes the escorting role is given to δαίμονες, lesser spirits that intermediate between gods and human beings. In the Jewish texts, this intermediary role belongs to angels who have a prominent role in many apocalyptic and related writings. Both good and bad angels are known. However, the idea of angels escorting the souls of the dead only appears in rather late texts, such as the *Testament of Asher*, the *Testament of Abraham*, and the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* but these may reflect older ideas.

Another feature in Luke's story with several counterparts in Jewish tradition is the role of Abraham in the hereafter. Abraham and other patriarchs are often described as ready to receive the righteous dead. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the hereafter are mentioned, for example, in 4 Maccabees, the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and the Synoptic tradition (most notably in the Q-saying behind Lk 13:28–29). Abraham is connected with eschatological secrets in several other writings as well (4 Ezra, *2 Bar., L.A.B., Gen. Rab., T. Ab., Apoc. Ab.*). In Luke's story, Abraham, who was known for his wealth but also for his hospitality, is a contrasting figure to the rich man who failed to show hospitality to the poor Lazarus. The rich man's appeal to Abraham links the story to the sermon of John the Baptist at the beginning of Luke's Gospel. Calling Abraham "father" does not help if one fails to "bear fruits worthy of repentance."

The torments of the rich man and the reward of Lazarus are also related using familiar imagery. Fire and thirst belong to the most frequently repeated images of otherworldly punishment in both Jewish

and pagan accounts. A third frequently used characteristic of the place of punishment is darkness but this does not appear in Luke's story. The actual agony of the rich man is juxtaposed with the vagueness of Lazarus' reward. He is consoled in Abraham's bosom, an expression found only in later texts that undoubtedly have been influenced by Luke's story. However, a similar phrase, "I fled into the bosom of the Queen of the dead" appears in a fourth century B.C.E. gold leaf. The fellowship with the patriarch connotes all kinds of positive images, such as protection, shelter, and rest, but also a honorary position at a heavenly banquet. Banquet imagery is often used in depictions of a blissful afterlife, especially in pagan sources, and Luke uses it frequently.

The place of torment and the place of consolation are separated from each other by an unbridgeable chasm. The chasm prevents any crossing from one side to the other, even if someone would want to. This permanent and insurmountable barrier underlines the finality of the reversal: no one can repent after death; the otherworldly fate depends on the earthly life. Chasms and other barriers are familiar features in many underworld descriptions. Their most common function is to distance the world of the dead from that of the living and prevent the dead from leaving the underworld. In Luke's account, however, the chasm separates different parts of the otherworld.

The torments of the rich man are described in a very physical manner. He is burning and he requests just a drop of water from Lazarus' fingertip to cool his tongue. Such bodily terminology does not mean that the dead were imagined to be corporeal. According to ancient philosophers, the soul was material and could be described in bodily terms. The souls bear marks of the earthly life and participate in activities, such as wrestling and dancing, that are unthinkable without a body. The bodily appearance of the souls is necessary so that others, both the living and the other dead, could recognize the dead. This is an important feature both in Luke's story and in many other accounts.

PART IV

# THE AFTERLIFE IMAGERY IN LUKE-ACTS

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

# PRELIMINARY REMARKS: A CONSISTENT ESCHATOLOGICAL SCHEME?

How does the afterlife scene in the Rich Man and Lazarus fit into Luke's overall eschatological view? Many a scholar has answered: poorly. The basic reason for this estimation is the immediacy of the otherworldly retribution and reward. Both men are transferred to what seems to be their final destination straight after death. However, elsewhere in his double work, Luke seems to presuppose—in accordance with the synoptic tradition—that there will be a general resurrection and judgment at the end of time. This tension has been resolved in various ways. One way is to lean on source critical arguments: only one of the views represents Luke's own thinking while the other comes from the sources he has used. Another way is to harmonize the different views: according to Luke's thinking, there are preliminary rewards and punishment straight after death (described in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus) followed by resurrection and final judgment at the end of time.

Both these solutions are based on the presumption that Luke has a coherent and intellectually consistent eschatological scheme where different pieces fit together.[1] If there are pieces in his double work that do not, they are discarded as traditional material that reflects views atypical of Luke. My purpose is to show that eschatological teaching in Luke-Acts, and the afterlife imagery Luke uses as a part of it, is not that simple. Luke has different eschatological emphases in different passages and contexts, depending first and foremost on the point he is striving to make. It seems to me that eschatological teaching and its coherence is not of primary interest to Luke or the key for understanding the purpose of his writing[2] but it serves other, more practical aims.

A usual stand in scholarship is to argue the very opposite: eschatology is of utmost importance to Luke,[3] and the literature on the

[1] Mattill, *Last Things*, 40; Puech, *Croyance*, 258; Carroll, *Response*, 165–66.
[2] Mattill, *Last Things*, 233–34; Maddox, *Purpose*, 182–83.
[3] Many scholars seem to view Luke (and other evangelists, as well) primarily as

subject is vast.[4] However, there is a great diversity of opinion concerning Luke's eschatological perspective and no agreement has been reached on the nature of Luke's future expectation. Quite opposite views have their advocates; according to some, Luke is motivated by the delay of the parousia, while for others, he is a fervent apocalyptic activist; some think his emphasis lies on the present reality of the Kingdom, while others argue for a future orientation; some see Luke as promoting an individual understanding of eschatology while, according to others, he waits for a collective judgment.[5] This diversity alone suggests that eschatology in Luke's double work is varied and ambiguous, and open to several different interpretations.

The immediate retribution depicted in the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:22) seems to reflect an individual understanding of eschatology. According to this view, everyone meets his or her personal *eschaton* individually at death, not collectively at the end of time. This kind of eschatological expectation has been considered odd and contradictory to Luke's overall view. Robert Maddox has overcome the difficulty by adopting the Gressmann hypothesis; the eschatological doctrine in the story is a borrowing from a pre-Christian folktale and carries no weight in itself. The point for Luke lies in the conclusion of the story and he did not take the eschatological description seriously. Maddox concludes:

> To see Luke's own eschatological doctrine in Luke 16:19–31 involves two rather obvious difficulties: first, this imported story stands isolated over against the references in Luke-Acts to the future resurrection of the just (and of the unjust); second, Jesus has no part in this eschatological action.[6]

This statement is a prime example of the way in which passages with a "non-fitting" content are discarded by source critical arguments. However, it is simply not true that there is a particular "imported story" behind Luke's account, as the evaluation of previ-

---

theologians and thus tend to overemphasize the theological reasons, such as eschatology, for his writings. It is dubious, however, whether we can categorize their views according to much later theological standards.

[4] It is not possible to give any thoroughgoing survey of the scholarly work done on the subject. I refer to the excellent overview in Carroll, *Response*, 1–30. See also the even more recent (but not as extensive) treatment in Nielsen, *Until It Is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts 20*, 6–26.

[5] Cf. Carroll, *Response*, 28–29.

[6] Maddox, *Purpose*, 103.

ous scholarship on the story has made clear.[7] But even if the description were based on popular pre-Christian beliefs it does not necessarily follow that it did not fit Luke's view. Why, in that case, would he have retained it and not changed it to better suit his own eschatological expectation? The idea that Luke simply took a story over without paying attention to its strange eschatology, either due to inadvertence or indifference, contradicts the important findings of the redaction critical method, namely, that the evangelists are creative authors and theologians, not only compilers of earlier traditions.[8] Maddox himself respects Luke as a "careful, reflective theologian."[9] If the evangelists have often quite freely rearranged, altered, and modified their traditions—as comparisons among the synoptic gospels makes clear—it is not credible that traditional ideas that contrast with their own views merely slip into their text without their noticing it.[10]

Moreover, in his statement, Maddox seems to demand such a consistency in Luke's thinking which seldom exists in ancient writings. This is the more surprising in light of his own statement that "it may be that Luke was less neatly systematic in his conception of eschatology than our 'redaction-critical' method of study tends to require of him."[11] Indeed, a too downright manner of applying the redaction critical method gives a one-sided, even distorted, picture of the overall view of the evangelist. When scholars learned to pay attention to the alterations the evangelists had made to their sources, they often concluded too hastily that these changes more or less equaled the overall theological thinking of the evangelist.[12] On the basis of this reconstruction, they evaluated what in the gospel stories suited this theology and what did not. The suitable passages were ascribed to "redaction," the conflicting ones to "tradition."

This kind of reasoning, where a certain set of criteria is applied to the same material on which it is based, is hopelessly circular. Moreover, it assumes that not only the evangelist is consistent in his thinking but also that the sources he uses are internally coherent. Thus, all that is inconsistent is the result of combining these two (or

---

[7] See chap. 2.2.
[8] Perrin, *What Is Redaction Criticism*, 67–68; cf. Enslin, "Luke and Matthew."
[9] Maddox, *Purpose*, 111.
[10] Cf. Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," 344.
[11] Maddox, *Purpose*, 102.
[12] For such an enthusiastic view, see, e.g., Perrin, *Redaction Criticism*, 66.

more) coherent systems into one story.[13] Yet, the reality must have been more complicated. All evangelists had access to multiple sources which themselves were far from coherent—Mark's gospel is a good example of this. Moreover, the outcome of the redactional activity must also meet some standards of coherence lest communication be hampered. Even if these standards of coherence do not necessarily equal *our* standards, the seeming inconsistencies must have somehow made sense to the evangelist and his audience.[14]

It is little wonder that such pursuit of coherence based on a rather mechanical source critical work has found many critics.[15] Recently, scholars have begun to emphasize that those passages that the evangelist has retained unaltered must also be taken into account to form a full picture of his theological thinking. In the words of Christopher Tuckett:

> There may be times when an author agrees with his tradition and is quite content to repeat it unaltered. Indeed, 'quite content' may be an understatement: an author may be passionately convinced of the value of his source material and he makes a thoroughly positive decision to include it without a change. Indeed the decision of an author to include the material in the first place must presumably indicate some measure of agreement between the author and his tradition.[16]

Thus, in order to discover the teaching of an evangelist on a certain topic, say Luke's eschatological teaching, we must consider not only the alterations he made to his tradition but also the traditions he left unchanged.[17] And vice versa: if a certain passage seems to contradict the overall teaching of the evangelist, this contradiction cannot be solved simply by source critical arguments. This does not necessarily mean that everything is of the same importance for Luke.

---

[13] Cf. Stone, "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'the End' in 4 Ezra," 346.

[14] Cf. Stone, "Coherence and Inconsistency," 346; Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading*, 38.

[15] Some of the early critics include Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, 19–20 and Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," 344–45. For more recent critical evaluations of the redaction critical method, see Tuckett, *Reading the New Testament: Methods of Interpretation*, 120–21; Sanders & Davies, *Studying*, 221–23; Ehrman, *New Testament*, 103–104.

[16] Tuckett, *Reading*, 121.

[17] Cf. Tuckett, *Reading*, 122. He points out that this indeed has been done in more recent studies and gives the work of Maddox as an example (note 10 on p. 134). This is partly correct (cf. Maddox, *Purpose*, 100–102) but this does not prevent Maddox from applying straightforward source critical arguments on individual passages, such as on Luke 16:19–31 and 23:42–43.

He may have retained traditions that were of more value for his audience than for himself and some of these traditions may well have conflicted with each other. It is evident that none of the gospels is an entirely smooth and coherent piece of work. However, it is daring to assume that Luke included traditions that were opposed to his own views.[18] In some way, he and his audience could make sense of the multivalent outcome, despite the "obvious difficulties" detected by present-day scholars.

In what follows, I will examine Luke's eschatological expectations in the light of the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. I argue first that the story, together with other passages in the double work that speak of immediate retribution after death, points to diversity and diffusion within Luke's eschatology. The eschatological outlook in the story serves its main point, that is, the necessity of repentance. Secondly, I claim that Luke's use of different images concerning fate after death is similarly ambivalent and cannot be harmonized into one scheme without difficulties. All this points to the conclusion that it is not a coherent doctrine of the "last things" Luke is after but eschatological images are in the service of paraenetic aims.

[18] Carroll, *Response*, 31–33.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

# THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS AND LUKE'S ESCHATOLOGY

How obvious, then, are the difficulties concerning the eschatological teaching in the Rich Man and Lazarus? In the light of the overall context of Luke-Acts, neither the emphasis on individual eschatology nor Jesus' absence from the eschatological action are unique features. The former does not stand "isolated over against the references in Luke-Acts to the future resurrection"[1] but both an individual and a collective view of eschatology is deeply rooted in Luke's double work. The latter, the fact that "Jesus has no part in this eschatological action"[2] in the Rich Man and Lazarus, has several counterparts elsewhere in Luke's work and fits perfectly the way Luke seems to understand salvation.

## 14.1. Jesus' Role in the Eschatological Salvation

Maddox does not explain in more detail what he means by the "eschatological action" in which Jesus has no part. I take it to mean the otherworldly fate, the result of the reversal: the condemning of the rich man to torment and Lazarus' ending up in bliss. It is true that Jesus has no role in this action in the story. He does not appear as a judge who separates the blessed ones from the cursed—or the sheep from the goats, to use a Matthean image. But this does not distinguish the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus from the rest of Luke's gospel. To seek a judging role for Jesus seems to reflect the Matthean kind of tradition, which is all but absent in Luke.

Luke has no parallel to Matthew's famous scene of the Son of Man who comes in his glory and sits in his glorious throne to judge the nations of the world (Mt 25:31–46). Moreover, while Matthew uses the same image in the passage that speaks of the disciples' future

[1] Cf. Maddox, *Purpose*, 103, quoted on p. 238.
[2] See previous note.

role as judges of Israel (which is an addition to Mark's text),[3] Luke places the saying into Jesus' speech at the last supper and has it differently:[4]

| Mt 19:28: | Lk 22:29–30: |
|---|---|
| Truly I say to you, in the new world when the Son of Man will sit on his glorious throne you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. | I appoint a kingdom for you, like my Father appointed for me, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel |

Thus, the Lukan Jesus does not refer to the enthroned Son of Man. This is hardly accidental for Luke never speaks of Jesus explicitly as an eschatological judge in his gospel.

A synoptic comparison shows the difference between the Matthean and the Lukan (and the Markan) Son of Man:[5]

| Mk 8:38 | Lk 9:26 | Mt 16:27 |
|---|---|---|
| For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, | For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words, | |
| the Son of Man will also be ashamed of him | of him will the Son of Man be ashamed | The Son of Man is |
| when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. | when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels. | to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, |
| | | and then he will repay (ἀπόδωσει) every one for what he has done. |

Luke's formulation is an almost *verbatim* quotation from Mark;[6] a verse Matthew has omitted as such. Mark also has no references to the Son of Man as judge elsewhere in his gospel. This makes it likely

[3] Cf. Mk 10:28–31; Lk 18:28–30.

[4] In synoptic comparisons, the translations are my own since the NRSV does not always retain the differences in the Greek.

[5] See previous note.

[6] Luke has omitted the words ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ and made some minor syntactical improvements.

that the descriptions of Jesus as the eschatological judge are Matthew's additions, not Luke's omissions from a common tradition.

Indeed, none of the passages in Luke that speak of the coming Son of Man depicts him as a judge.[7] In some other Son-of-Man-passages, the idea of judgment is close, most notably in Luke 21:36: "But watch at all times, praying that you may have strength to escape all these things that will take place, and to stand before the Son of Man."[8] However, the role of the Son of Man is not stated clearly and he is not called a judge.

In those passages that speak of the coming judgment, Jesus has no role as an eschatological judge (Lk 10:12,13–15; 11:29–32,50–51).[9] All these passages derive from the Q tradition. The only one that speaks of the Son of Man is Luke 11:29–32 (par. Mt 12:38–42) but the Son of Man is not described as the agent of judgment but as a "sign for this generation," an equivalent to "the sign of Jonah." This rather cryptic statement probably refers to Jesus' healing and preaching activity. Just as Jonah preached to the people of Nineveh (who took heed of his preaching and repented), Jesus is preaching to this generation, which, however, remains unrepentant.[10] The only agents of judgment that are mentioned in this passage are, somewhat surprisingly, the queen of the South and the men of Nineveh who will condemn (κατακρίνω) this generation. This is unlikely to mean that they are the ones who will give the verdict; rather they are examples whose right action is contrasted to the non-action of this generation. Thus, they appear as witnesses who will testify against this generation.

Nowhere in the gospel of Luke, then, is Jesus depicted as a judge of this world. The situation is somewhat different in the book of Acts. According to Acts 10:42, Peter reports how Jesus commanded the apostles "to testify that he is the one ordained (ὁ ὡρισμένος) by

[7] See, e.g., the following passages: Lk 12:40 ("the Son of Man is coming at an unexpected hour"); Lk 18:8 ("when the Son of Man comes, will he find faith on earth?"); Lk 21:27 ("the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory").

[8] Cf. Lk 12:8: "Everyone who acknowledges me before others, the Son of Man also will acknowledge before the angels of God." Here, rather than a judge, the Son of Man acts as an advocate at the judgment.

[9] See the fuller treatment of these passages below on pp. 255–56.

[10] Matthew understands "the sign of Jonah" differently. For him, Jonah's stay in the belly of the fish for three days anticipated the death and resurrection of Jesus. See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 933: Bovon, *Lukas 2*, 199–202.

God as judge of the living and the dead (κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν)." In Acts 17:30–31, Paul proclaims to the Athenians: "While God has overlooked the times of human ignorance, now he commands all people everywhere to repent, because he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness through a man whom he has appointed (μέλλει κρίνειν [. . .] ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὥρισεν; NRSV: "he will have the world judged [. . .] by a man . . .), and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead." In both passages, God has appointed (ὁρίζω) Jesus to have a special role in the judgment but the ultimate authority rests with God. This resembles the Matthean view of Jesus as the judge of the world (cf. also the Son of Man in *1 En* 62–63). However, the claim that "all authority in heaven and on earth" is given to Jesus (Mt 28:18) hardly corresponds Luke's view.

In the light of the overall view of Luke's double work, it comes as no surprise, then, that Jesus does not have a role as a judge in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. The otherworldly fate of the two men is determined simply by their earthly life. Even though the rich man is not explicitly characterized as wicked, it becomes clear that he is condemned because he failed to repent while he still had an opportunity to do so.[11] In order to avoid the place of torment, the brothers of the rich man also ought to repent. Moses and the prophets guide everybody to do this; there is no need for a message from the world of the dead. Repentance should become visible by concrete actions. The brothers should stop the showing off and feasting like the rich man and share their fortunes with their poor neighbors.

Many other parables of the Lukan Jesus also teach that repentance is not only a necessary but also a sufficient precondition for salvation.[12] In the Prodigal Son, the father accepts and forgives the

[11] Nave, *Role*, 187.

[12] Parrott suggests that the theme of repentance unites 15 parables that are peculiar to Luke (the Two Debtors, the Good Samaritan, the Reluctant Friend, the Rich Fool, the Barren Fig Tree, Not Seeking Honor at Table, the Proper Guests, Counting the Cost, the Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Dutiful Servant, the Unjust Judge, the Pharisee and the Tax Collector), which, according to him, derive from a special parable source; "The Dishonest Steward (Luke 16.1–8a) and Luke's Special Parable Collection," 505–11. However, it is questionable whether repentance is really a unifying theme in all these parables, especially in the Reluctant Friend, Not Seeking Honor, Proper Guests, Counting the Cost, the Unjust Steward, the Dutiful Servant, and the Unjust Judge.

son who has "come to himself" (Lk 15:17) and confesses his sins (v. 21), i.e., repents.[13] Salvation by repentance is also closely associated with the Barren Fig Tree, which is an allegory of the non-repentant Israel (cf. the preceding verses 13:1–5), and the Pharisee and the Tax Collector, where the tax collector is a positive and the Pharisee a negative paradigm of the right kind of penitence. The lawyer to whom Jesus addresses the Good Samaritan hears that he "shall live" if he loves God above all and his neighbor as himself, i.e., obeys the law and the prophets (Lk 10:25–28), which, according to the teaching of the Rich Man and Lazarus, will lead to repentance.[14]

Repentance and salvation are also closely connected elsewhere in Luke-Acts. Salvation is possible only by repenting.[15] The sinful woman who anoints Jesus is a perfect example of a repentant sinner. As a result of her act of penitence, the sins of the anointing woman are forgiven and Jesus declares: "Your faith has saved you" (Lk 7:50). The repentance of Zacchaeus brings salvation to his house (Lk 19:8–10). Over and over again, it is repentance that counts in Luke's soteriological view. Jesus' role as a redeemer is reduced to a minimum; it is God who redeems those who repent.[16] Jesus represents God in his life and teaching; he is the one who has come to seek out and save the lost (Lk 15:4–5; 19:10) by proclaiming repentance. His death and resurrection are a confirmation of this, not an atonement for sins that would bring salvation of itself like in Paul or in Mark.[17]

---

[13] Some scholars claim that the astounding point of the story is that repentance is *not* required prior to salvation. This, however, is hardly true as the return to his father and the confession of his sins is a deliberate decision of the prodigal son. See Räisänen, "Prodigal," 1620. The verb μετανοέω does not occur in the story but in the preceding context (Lk 15:7,10). Both preceding parables, the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin, end with a statement how the angels of God rejoice for repentant sinners. However, the statement does not match the parables as the sheep, let alone the coin, do not repent in these parables. It seems that Luke has formulated these statements with the Prodigal Son in mind. See Drury, *Parables*, 141; Räisänen, "Prodigal," 1618.

[14] Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, 16–18.

[15] Tanghe, "Abraham," 568.

[16] Jesus is called a savior only once in the gospel of Luke, in the words of the angel in the birth narrative ("to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord;" Lk 2:11), and twice in Acts (5:31; 13:23). Cf. also Lk 1:47 where it is God who is called the savior.

[17] See Pokorný, "Lukas 15,11–32 und die lukanische Soteriologie," 186–87; Ehrman, *New Testament*, 117–18.133.

The fact that the theme of repentance occurs all through Luke's double work shows its importance for him.[18] The call to repentance also appears in Luke's sources (cf. Mk 1:15; 6:12; Mt 3:8,11; 11:21; 12:41) but he has expanded the treatment of the theme. A clear example of this is the story of the call of Levi (Lk 5:27–32; parr. Mk 2:13–17; Mt 9:9–13). The Pharisees murmur against Jesus' eating with the sinners. According to both Mark and Matthew, Jesus answers that he has not come to call the righteous but the sinners. Luke adds to this: to repentance (οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν).[19] Similarly, Luke adds an emphasis on repentance to the parable of the Lost Sheep (Lk 15:7, contrast Mt 18:12–14),[20] to the exhortation to forgive (Lk 17:3–4; contrast Mt 18:15–17), and to the story of the thieves on the cross (Lk 23:39–43; contrast Mk 15:32; Mt 27:44).

Repentance is associated with ethical behavior all through Luke-Acts.[21] A change of thinking is seldom enough; it usually leads to a change of behavior and way of life, often associated with the proper use of wealth.[22] This is shown in John's sermon (Lk 3:10–14), which Luke has taken over from Q but to which he has added[23] an explicit example of what "fruits worthy of repentance" mean in practice.[24] When the crowds, tax collectors and soldiers ask John what they should do (in order to be saved), he tells them to share their possessions with those in need and refrain from any misuse of their positions. Similarly, Zacchaeus demonstrates an example of true repentance as he gives half of his possessions to the poor and pays back four times as much as he has defrauded (Lk 19:1–10). The significance of repentance also becomes evident in the mission instruc-

[18] Nave, *Role*, 29–30, 145.

[19] Taeger, *Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Mensches und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas*, 135; Kiilunen,"Sanoma kääntymyksestä—Luukkaan toimintaohjelma kirkolle," 106–107; J.T. Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 171; Nave, *Role*, 166.

[20] Räisänen, "Prodigal," 1618.

[21] Nave, *Role*, 147,189 and *passim*.

[22] Taeger, *Mensch*, 222. There is no action showing the change of heart in the stories of the penitent thief on the cross (Lk 23:39–43) and the tax collector in the temple (Lk 18:10–14). The former is granted entrance to paradise, the latter goes home justified without any real sign of repentance.

[23] Several commentators consider vv. 10–14 Luke's own creation; see, e.g., Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 155; Schmithals, *Lukas*, 52; Bovon, *Lukas 1*, 173. According to Fitzmyer, the possibility of Lukan composition "cannot be completely excluded;" *Luke*, 464.

[24] Nave, *Role*, 146–59; cf. Kiilunen, "Sanoma," 104; Seccombe, *Possessions*, 183.

tions the risen Jesus gives to his followers: to proclaim repentance and forgiveness of sins (Lk 24:47; contrast Mt 28:18–20).[25] In Acts, Luke shows how the apostles and Paul do exactly this. Those who repent and become Christians show this in their new way of life, which involves sharing their possessions (Acts 2:44–45; 4:32–35).

In Acts, the connection between repentance, forgiveness of sins, and salvation still remains, even though the necessity to believe in Christ Jesus and to be baptized in his name also becomes a part of the soteriological scheme after the resurrection.[26] Thus, in his Pentecostal speech, Peter exhorts his audience: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven" (Acts 2:38). Similarly, Paul tells the king Agrippa how he has declared "also to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God and do deeds consistent with repentance" (Acts 26:20).

In other words, the first step towards salvation in Acts is repentance and turning to God, followed by baptism in the name of Jesus. Then God will forgive sins and grant the Holy Spirit. In different contexts, this salvific scheme is phrased somewhat differently; once it is "faith in Jesus" that brings salvation (Acts 16:31) but the overall pattern concerning salvation and Jesus' role in it remains the same. In the words of Bart Ehrman:

> Jesus' death does not bring an atonement (contrast Mark's Gospel). It is a miscarriage of justice. Nor does Jesus' resurrection, in itself, bring salvation. It instead demonstrates Jesus' vindication by God. When people recognize how maliciously Jesus was treated, they realize their own guilt before God—even if they were not present at Jesus' trial. They have committed sins, and the death of Jesus is a symbol of the worst sin imaginable, the execution of the prophet chosen by God. The news of Jesus' death and vindication drives people to their knees in repentance. When they turn from their sins and join the community of Christian believers (through baptism), they are forgiven and granted salvation. Thus salvation for Luke does not come through the death of Jesus per se; it comes through repentance and forgiveness of sins.[27]

The soteriological view reflected in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, then, is deeply embedded in the overall view of salvation

[25] Kiilunen, "Sanoma," 103; Nave, *Role*, 191–98.
[26] See Acts 2:38–40; 3:19–20; 4:12; 5:31; 8:20–22; 10:43; 13:38–39; 15:11; 16:31; 17:30–31; 20:21; 22:14–16; 26:17–20.
[27] Ehrman, *New Testament*, 133.

in Luke's double work. Jesus' absence either as a judge or a savior from its "eschatological action" is in no way unique or surprising.

## 14.2. Eschatology—Future or Present, Collective or Individual?

Eschatology has been a prominent theme in Lukan studies ever since the dawn of redaction criticism.[28] The seminal claim of Hans Conzelmann that Luke's whole purpose in writing his double work was to overcome the crisis caused by the delay of the parousia has affected all subsequent scholarly work on the matter.[29] According to Conzelmann, Luke made significant changes to his tradition in order to replace the expectation of an imminent end by a salvation historical scheme that moves the ultimate end to the indefinite future. There also exist traces of an imminent end in the gospel but they are mere echoes from Luke's tradition and do not represent his own thinking.

Even though it is undeniable that Luke has mitigated the expectation of an imminent end of his tradition,[30] Conzelmann's thesis has faced severe criticism and has, quite rightly, been deemed too narrow and methodologically problematic.[31] Many scholars have argued that Luke has retained the belief in an imminent parousia.[32] We can hardly speak of any scholarly consensus, but the basic position of many scholars seems to be that *both* the delayed parousia *and* the imminent end belong to Luke's view.[33] The delay of the parousia

---

[28] Cf. Carroll, *Response*, 1.

[29] Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, 87–127. The book was first published in 1954.

[30] This is evident in the view of such passages as Lk 9:27//Mk 9:1; Lk 19:11; Lk 21//Mk 13; Lk 22:69//Mk 14:62; Acts 1:6–8. See Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," 336–40; Tuckett, *Reading*, 121–22; Ehrman, *New Testament*, 119–20.

[31] See Francis, "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts," 54; Maddox, *Purpose*, 100–102; Carroll, *Response*, 10–12; Nielsen, *Until*, 12–15.

[32] Francis, "Eschatology," 58–59; Mattill, *Last Things*, 41–112; Carroll, *Response*, 167.

[33] Wilson explains these two contradictory strands in terms of pastoral reasons; "Lukan Eschatology," 345–46: "Luke was a practical man writing in response to practical problems." In Wilson's view, Luke was fighting a war on two fronts: he addressed the teaching of the delayed parousia against those who were fervently reviving apocalyptic expectations, and the teaching of an imminent end against those who were losing their faith and becoming lax in their morals. It is highly questionable, however, whether we can infer the actual situation of Luke's community from the text in such a straightforward manner. See also the criticism by Ellis: "But would Luke be unaware that the over-eager Christians would fasten on the 'soon' passages and the morally lax notice the 'delay'?" ("Fonction (note additionelle)," 297–98). Ellis himself acknowledges both the delay and the imminence

was "a plain historical fact which Luke had of course to acknowledge."[34] However, he believed that the end lay in the near future of his generation.[35]

According to some scholars, the individual strand of eschatology in Luke's gospel is related to the delayed end.[36] The logic runs that, since the ultimate parousia had failed to occur within the expected time, Luke began to interpret traditional eschatological language in a new, individual way. Even though Luke did not abandon the belief in the future coming of the Son of Man, the postponement of the parousia caused embarrassment as members of the Christian community began to die (cf. 1 Thess 4:13–17). As C. Kingsley Barrett stated:

> Luke saw that for the individual Christian death was truly *an* ἔσχατον (though not *the* ἔσχατον); it was therefore not wrong to think of it [. . .] in eschatological terms. Thus the death of each Christian would be marked by what we may term a private and personal *parousia* of the Son of Man. That which was to happen in a universal sense at the last day, happened in individual terms when a Christian came to the last days of his life.[37]

According to Jacques Dupont, individual eschatology is reflected in several passages in Luke's gospel. In addition to 16:19–31, these are the Rich Fool (12:16–21), the Unjust Steward (16:1–8), and the story of the penitent thief on the cross (23:39–43). In Acts, it is seen in the words concerning the fate of Judas (1:25), the story of the death

---

of the parousia in Luke's eschatology but incorporates them into a two-stage eschatological scheme: Jesus' resurrection gives eschatology a present aspect but only his parousia in the future will bring the final consummation; see "Die Funktion der Eschatologie im Lukasevangelium," 395–99 (= "Fonction," 58–61; further references to Ellis' article will be made to its German version).

[34] Maddox, *Purpose*, 105; cf. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*, 6.10.20; Ehrman, *New Testament*, 119.

[35] Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," 346; Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 14,19–10,25,41; Mattill, *Last Things*, 6 and *passim*; Maddox, *Purpose*, 123; Carroll, *Response*, 167; Ehrman, *New Testament*, 139.

[36] Barrett, "Stephen and the Son of Man," 35–37; cf. Ellis and his critical remarks; "Funktion," 390. Others who see individual eschatology as a special emphasis in Luke's gospel include Dupont, "L'après-mort dans l'oeuvre de Luc," 3–4 (= "Die Individuelle Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte," 37–38; further references to Dupont's article will be made to its original French version); Schneider, *Parusiegleichnisse im Lukas-Evangelium*, 78–84; Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 161; Milikowski, "Which Gehenna," 242–44; Reinmuth, "Ps.-Philo," 32–34; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 196.

[37] Barrett, "Stephen," 35–36.

of Stephen (7:55–60), and in Paul's encouraging the disciples in Antioch (14:22).[38] Indeed, in Dupont's view, the emphasis on an individual's fate after death is a special Lukan interest that runs parallel to the traditional collective eschatology (which Luke also retains).[39] Such an understanding of Luke's eschatology has been severely criticized.[40] However, even the critics must admit that ". . . there is indeed a small element of 'individual eschatology' in Luke-Acts."[41] But, the critics claim, this individual strand is neither strong nor peculiar to Luke.[42] It does not correspond to his distinctive eschatological thinking but only represents an alternative way added to the traditional eschatology.[43] To evaluate these opinions, I consider in turn the passages where Dupont found the strongest evidence of individual eschatology.

Not all the passages cited by Dupont are equally convincing. To start with the least persuasive, Acts 14:22 is open to several interpretations. The verse contains Paul's encouraging words to the disciples in Antioch: ". . . it is through many persecutions that we must enter the kingdom of God (δεῖ [. . .] εἰσελθεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ)." The expression "kingdom (of God)" occurs seven other times in Acts[44] but it never explicitly refers to a coming reality (as is usual in the gospels).[45] In Acts 14:22, it clearly denotes a place where the Christians are going. According to Dupont, the formulation of the verse has a close parallel at the end of Luke's gospel (24:26) where the risen Jesus says how it was necessary that "the Messiah should suffer these things and then enter into his glory (ἔδει παθεῖν [. . .] καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ)." Since Jesus refers to an otherworldly reality, Acts 14:22 also refers to the postmortem abode of the faithful.[46] The otherworldly character of the kingdom in the verse is, however, far from certain. Moreover, even though entering the

[38] Dupont, "Après-mort," 4–20.
[39] Dupont, "Après-mort," 4, 21.
[40] Maddox, *Purpose*, 103–105; Puech, *Croyance*, 262–63; Carroll, *Response*, 60–71.
[41] Maddox, *Purpose*, 104. Cf. Carroll, *Response*, 71.
[42] Maddox, *Purpose*, 104–105; Carroll, *Response*, 66.
[43] No matter how much Maddox tones down the individual strand of Luke's eschatology, the fact that he must admit Luke's accepting it—albeit "to a quite small extent"—contradicts his earlier statement that the Rich Man and Lazarus is an isolated case of individual eschatology.
[44] 1:3,6; 8:12; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23,31.
[45] See further below pp. 289–91.
[46] Dupont, "Après-mort," 9–11.

kingdom in Acts 14:22 and the glory of Messiah in Luke 24:26 were synonyms, the former does not necessarily contain the idea of individual eschatology. The entering into the kingdom might as well take place at the end of time.[47]

The Rich Fool and the Unjust Steward also remain ambiguous in this respect. Neither one is explicit about whether these men face their fate straight after death.[48] On the other hand, there is nothing in either story that speaks against the individual interpretation. On the contrary, both the words in 12:20 ("this very night your life is being demanded of you") and the ones in 16:9 ("make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal habitations") are more naturally read to indicate that both men are brought to account for their lives immediately after death. In the latter case, this view is supported by the fact that the story is placed in the same context as the Rich Man and Lazarus. The unjust steward, who took heed of the hour and secured his future, is an antithesis to the rich man who realizes only in the hereafter that he has misused his possessions.[49]

The reference to Judas' fate is a somewhat stronger case. The words concerning Judas' turning aside his apostleship to go "to his own place" (εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον) are best understood as stating that Judas is already in his final destination.[50] An even clearer example of individual eschatology is in the story of Stephen's trial and

---

[47] See also the criticism by Mattill, *Last Things*, 52 and Carroll, *Response*, 61, n. 83.

[48] According to Dupont, both stories must be understood eschatologically at the level of Lukan redaction; "Après-mort," 5–8, 12–15. In chapter 12, the rich man is a fool since he did not take the postmortem fate into account. This becomes clear in v. 21 ("So it is with those who store up treasures for themselves but are not rich towards God") which the evangelist has linked with the story. In Dupont's view, Jesus' words in v. 33 ("Sell your possessions, and give alms. Make purses for yourselves that do not wear out, an unfailing treasure in heaven, where no thief comes near and no moth destroys") also support this reading. The rich man was a fool as he only gathered riches for himself instead of collecting an imperishable treasure by selling his possessions and giving the money to the poor. For a different view, see Seccombe, *Possessions*, 143. Similarly, in Dupont's view, the story of the Unjust Steward reflects individual eschatology in its context. The moment when the unjust mammon fails (in 16:9) refers to the death of an individual, not the end of time. However, see Ireland, *Stewardship*, 100–10.

[49] For a more detailed analysis of the story, see further below pp. 284–88.

[50] This expression has a parallel in the Hebrew Bible; see Dupont, "Après-mort," 20. After blessing Abraham, Bileam is said to return to his own place (LXX: εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ). According to later rabbinic reading, this referred to the fact that Bileam was condemned to hell. Dupont suggests that Luke knew this tradition and applied the same words to Judas. This suggestion, however, remains highly speculative.

death in Acts 7:55–60, as argued by Barrett.[51] He pays special attention to v. 56 where Stephen declares how he sees the Son of Man standing on the right side of God. According to Barrett, the verse reflects individual eschatology for two reasons. First, it is the only place outside the gospels where Jesus is called by the eschatological title, the Son of Man. Second, in contrast to all the other passages that speak of the exalted Son of Man in heaven, Luke does not describe the Son of Man *sitting* on the right side of God (Lk 22:69; parr. Mt 26:64//Mk 14:62). Instead, he has stood up in order to receive the Christian martyr at his death. The problem with Barrett's interpretation, however, is that the vision of the Son of Man is not actually related to Stephen's death but to his speech in front of the Sanhedrin. If the term "Son of Man" refers to Jesus' role at the judgment it may be related to the contents of the speech: the heavenly Son of Man confirms Stephen's verdict against the Jews (7:51–53).[52]

Even though the description of Stephen's trial has no bearing on Luke's eschatological view, the story of his death (7:59–60) does. Luke clearly thinks that Jesus receives the spirit of the martyr immediately upon his death. Luke has formulated the story of Stephen's death on the basis of the story of the crucifixion. Whereas Jesus dies crying: "Father, into your hands I commend my spirit" (Lk 23:46), Stephen prays likewise: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts 7:59).[53] It would be quite forced to think that Luke thought this would happen—in either case—only in the last day. A parallel case is found in the *Apocalypse of Moses* where Eve prays after the death of Adam: "God of All, receive my spirit" after which "straightway she delivered up her spirit to God" (*Apoc. Mos.* 42:8).

However, by far the clearest evidence of individual eschatology in Luke is in Jesus' words to the penitent thief on the cross: "Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in paradise" (Lk 23:43). Gerhard Lohfink used the standard source critical argument of his time and argued that the eschatological teaching in the story is foreign to

---

[51] "Stephen," 36–37. Maddox also admits this to be "a stronger case;" *Purpose*, 104. He remains uncertain "just how Luke combined this concept with that of the resurrection at the last day."

[52] Thus Ellis, "Funktion," 390–91, n. 11.

[53] A similar case can be seen in the comparison of Lk 23:34 to Acts 7:60—if the former belongs to the original text. Whereas Jesus prays that God would "forgive them for they do not know what they are doing," Stephen prays to Jesus: "Lord, do not hold this sin against them."

Luke's thinking.[54] According to him, Luke accepted the story despite this strange eschatological view since its message of the forgiving of a penitent pleased him. Such argumentation is untenable, as I have argued above; the apparent inconsistencies within a single writing cannot be solved merely by source critical arguments.[55] Moreover, there are good reasons to suspect that the conversation between Jesus and the thief is Luke's own creation. First, it does not occur in the older passion tradition. According to Mark and Matthew, both thieves scorn Jesus. Second, the idea of repentance at the last possible moment of an individual's life fits well with Luke's overall teaching on the matter. The story is "the climax of all the stories of repentance in Luke."[56] And third, it is not the only passage in Luke that reflects individual eschatology.

These examples show that the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus is far from being "isolated over against the references in Luke-Acts to the future resurrection."[57] Especially the story of the repentant thief and the description of Stephen's death clearly indicate that in Luke's view, the dead enter immediately to the otherworld. However, there is no need to postulate any crisis caused by the delay of the parousia to explain this belief. The belief that the dead experience their otherworldly fate immediately occurs frequently in Jewish writings.[58] This implies that it was not an uncommon view in Luke's time.

The picture of Luke's eschatology is, however, more complicated than this. There are also several references to a collective resurrection and judgment on the last day. According to Jesus, ". . . on that day it will be more tolerable (ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται) for Sodom" than for a town which has not received Jesus' disciples (Lk 10:12; par. Mt 11:24). In the same context, he warns the towns of Chorasin and Bethsaida that ". . . at the judgment it will be more tolerable (ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται) for Tyre and Sidon than for you (Lk 10:14; par Mt 11:22)." Likewise, "this generation" will learn that "the queen

---

[54] Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*, 237.

[55] See the discussion in chap. 13, pp. 239–40 above. Strikingly, Maddox accepts this argument, despite his own warnings against the pitfalls of redaction criticism; *Purpose*, 102, 104.

[56] Kiilunen, "Sanoma," 115. (My translation.)

[57] Cf. Maddox, *Purpose*, 103, quoted above on p. 238.

[58] E.g., *1 En.*, 2 Macc, 4 Macc, 4 Ezra, *2 Bar., L.A.B., Apoc. Mos., T. Ab., Jos. Asen.*

of the South will arise at the judgment (ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει) with the people of this generation and condemn them" and that "the people of Nineveh will arise at the judgment (ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει) with this generation and condemn it" (Lk 11:31–32; par Mt 12:41–42). In all these passages, the verbs are in the future tense. Thus, they clearly refer to a future judgment where all the people are gathered, this generation together with the citizens of different cities and countries. This is similar to Luke 20:47, a passage where Jesus says that the scribes will receive the greater condemnation (λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα). It probably refers to the universal judgment at the end of time.

All these passages derive from Luke's tradition. All others are from Q except Luke 20:47 which belongs to the triple tradition.[59] The fact that Luke has retained the references to a collective judgment practically unaltered attests that he has found these expressions and ideas in his sources suitable for his purposes. Moreover, references to a future resurrection also occur in passages that might originate from Luke himself. Jesus promises those who have invited "the poor, the crippled, the lame, and the blind" instead of friends and relatives that "you will be blessed, because they cannot repay you, for you will be repaid (ἀνταποδοθήσεται) at the resurrection of the righteous (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων; Lk 14:14)." In Acts, Paul declares that he has put his hope on the resurrection of both the righteous and the unrighteous (ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων; Acts 24:15). Paul also envisions a future judgment in his speech in the Areopagus ("he has fixed a day on which he will judge the world," Acts 17:31) and before the governor Felix ("he argued about [. . .] future judgment," Acts 24:25).[60]

### *Resurrection—When and for Whom?*

These references to a collective, future eschatological consummation seem to contain a further contradiction. On the one hand, those passages, such as Acts 24:15, that speak of the coming judgment indicate that both the righteous and the unrighteous will be resurrected. Indeed, in these passages, resurrection is needed for the

[59] Cf. Mk 12:40; Luke has retained the verse *verbatim*.

[60] There are several other passages in Acts that refer to resurrection; cf. Acts 4:2; 17:18; 23:6,8; 24:21. They are not explicit when the resurrection will take place, but a general resurrection in the future seems to be indicated.

specific reason so that the dead can be judged.[61] On the other hand, there are passages that refer only to the resurrection of the righteous. In addition to Luke 14:14, this view is reflected in Luke's version of the debate with the Sadducees. There Jesus speaks of "those who are considered worthy of a place in that age and in the resurrection from the dead" (οἱ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν; Lk 20:35). This implies that not all will be raised but only the righteous. Jesus' answer, according to Luke, differs considerably from its Markan counterpart (Mk 12:25) and scholars commonly ascribe the differences to Luke's redaction.[62] A third passage that seems to speak of the resurrection of the righteous only is in Paul's speech to the Jews in Antioch of Pisidia (even though the word "resurrection" does not occur in it): "It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you. Since you reject it and judge yourselves to be unworthy of eternal life (οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς), we are now turning to the Gentiles" (Acts 13:46). This would imply that the fate of the unrighteous is destruction and oblivion; they will not be granted any kind of afterlife.[63]

This contradiction has been resolved with similar arguments to those used to solve the tensions in Luke's overall eschatological view. One is, again, the source critical solution: only one of the views represents Luke's own thinking while the other comes from his sources and does not correspond to his own view. Accordingly, Hans Conzelmann maintains that the saying concerning the resurrection of the righteous in Luke 14:14 is traditional and Luke himself thinks that all will be raised.[64] Luke's own emphasis on the resurrection of all the dead is evident in the missionary speeches of Acts where the audience is exhorted to repent, e.g., Acts 4:2; 17:18,31; 23:6; 24:15,21. On the other hand, Chaim Milikowski argues the opposite: Luke only believes in the resurrection of the righteous.[65] Unlike his sources,

[61] Hiers, "Day of Judgment," 81.

[62] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1299; Seim, *Double Message*, 213.

[63] This kind of view is reflected, e.g., in 2 Macc. The seven martyred brothers claim that King Antiochus will not escape the punishment of God (7:17, 19, 31, 35–36). His punishment is a horrible, stinking death (9:5–10, 28) and there will be no resurrection for him (7:14). Resurrection is only for the righteous (7:9, 10–11). Cf. *Ps. Sol.* 3:11–12; 13:11.

[64] Conzelmann, *Mitte der Zeit*, 101–102,191.

[65] Milikowski,"Which Gehenna," 243–44.

Luke does not emphasize a collective, universal judgment but immediate retribution after death when the ungodly will face punishment and the righteous will be taken into paradise.[66] At the end of time, only the righteous will be raised with Jesus at his parousia.

The existence of two such opposite solutions based on a similar methodology illuminates well the weaknesses of such source critical arguments, as discussed above.[67] Both reconstructions can also be criticized on other bases. In refutation of Conzelmann, it may be pointed out that, exclusive of Acts 24:15, not one of the references to resurrection in the missionary speeches of Acts states explicitly who will be among the resurrected. The exhortation to repent would work quite well even if only the righteous are envisioned as being raised. Moreover, Conzelmann does not discuss Luke's version of the debate with the Sadducees at all (Lk 20:27–40; see below pp. 259–61). Milikowski's reconstruction, on the other hand, falls short since he does not take into account the collective nature of the resurrection in passages such as the rebukes against the Galilean towns. All the inhabitants of the towns mentioned, this generation altogether, will arise together with the queen of South and the men of Nineveh. This would hardly happen at an individual judgment. Moreover, he does not take into consideration those passages in Acts that refer to the resurrection of both the just and the unjust (specifically Acts 24:15; cf. Acts 17:31; 24:25).

Another way of solving the tension between a general resurrection and the resurrection of the just alone is harmonization.[68] According to this view, Luke speaks of a general resurrection all along. Those passages that only mention the resurrection of the righteous partially describe the future event but do not exclude the resurrection of the unrighteous as such. This view is likewise problematic. The resurrection of the righteous in Lk 14:14 might perhaps be read as a ref-

---

[66] According to Milikowski, whereas Matthew clearly speaks about "the day of judgment (ἡμέρα κρίσεως)", Luke distinguishes the judgment from the end of time by using the expressions "that day (ἡμέρα ἐκείνη)" and plain "judgment (κρίσις)." The first expression refers to the coming of the kingdom of God, the latter to the individual judgment which takes place at death. Thus, Luke has cleverly changed the idea of a collective judgment at the end of the world, as he received from his tradition, into an event at the death of each individual.

[67] See further pp. 237–41.

[68] See, e.g., Ellis who states: "In the New Testament the last judgment presupposes a resurrection of saved and lost, although only the resurrection of the righteous, qualitatively considered, is a resurrection in the true sense;" *Luke*, 194.

erence to the just who will be resurrected in a general resurrection but the phrase "to be worthy of resurrection" hardly leaves room for the resurrection of those who are not worthy, i.e., the unrighteous.

Thus, the debate between Jesus and the Sadducees over resurrection seems to be a key passage for understanding Luke's view on the matter (Lk 20:27–40; parr. Mk 12:18–27; Mt 22:23–33). The report of the debate has evoked further debates among scholars concerning its point and meaning. Luke has retained the initial question by the Sadducees nearly intact; if a woman has been married to seven brothers, whose wife will she be at the resurrection?[69] Instead, he has altered Jesus' answer considerably:[70]

| Mk 12:24–27 | Lk 20:34–38 |
|---|---|
| Is not this why you are wrong, that you do not know the scriptures or the power of God? | |
| | The children of this age marry and are given in marriage; |
| For when they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given to marriage, | but those who are considered worthy of a place in that age and in the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage. |
| but are like angels in heaven. | For they cannot die any more, because they are like angels and are children of God, being children of the resurrection. |
| And concerning the dead being raised, | And that the dead are raised |
| have you not read in the book of Moses, in the story about the bush, how God said to him, | Moses himself showed, in the story about the bush, where he speaks of |
| 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? | the Lord as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. |
| He is not God of the dead, but of the living; you are quite wrong. | Now he is God not of the dead, but of the living; for to him all are alive. |

The expression "those worthy of resurrection" is not the only Lukan addition to the story. Another is the concluding remark "for to him all are alive (πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν)." This has been read in two different ways. The first alternative is to interpret the Lukan phrasing

[69] Luke has only made some linguistic improvements.

[70] Matthew follows Mark rather faithfully here. For the translation, see n. 4 on p. 244.

as an argument for immortality.[71] The patriarchs are not really dead but alive, alive to God. They were alive at the time God spoke to Moses and thus God is the God of the living, not of the dead.[72] In the view of the Lukan Jesus, then, the resurrection of the patriarchs means their postmortem exaltation to heaven. The dead do not have to wait to inherit new life on a renewed earth but they already participate in spiritual and immortal heavenly life.[73] According to the other alternative, Jesus cannot speak of immortality. It not only presupposes a body-soul dualism, which is incompatible with the biblical thought, but also ruins the whole point of the controversy: if the patriarchs are alive, there is no need for resurrection and thus Jesus has not proven his point.[74] Thus, the Lukan version does not differ from that of the other synoptics; Jesus refers to a general resurrection at the end of time when the patriarchs will live again.[75]

The arguments for the second alternative are tenuous. As we have seen, a body-soul dualism was not a strange concept in contemporary Jewish writings.[76] The phrase "for to him all are alive" has close affinities to expressions in 4 Maccabees, which clearly convey immortality.[77] The present tense of the verb ζάω indicates that the patriarchs live now—not that they are waiting to come alive. Moreover, the Lukan Jesus gives the Sadducees a "double answer;"[78] the dead are raised and the patriarchs are alive. Thus, there is no need to make any clear-cut juxtaposition of the two alternatives or to harmonize them into a single view. It seems clear that Jesus' answer in v. 38 means that the patriarchs have been alive all along.[79] On the other hand, the dead will be raised, no doubt at the end of time, as v. 37 indicates. Perhaps this does not accord with the demands of present-day logic but clearly Luke did not think these ideas were contradictory.

---

[71] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1301; cf. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 81.
[72] Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 738.
[73] McDannell & Lang, *Heaven*, 26–27.
[74] This is argued by Ellis; "Jesus, the Sadducees, and Qumran," 275; *Luke*, 235.
[75] Cf. Meier, "The Debate on the Resurrection of the Dead," 10,16. Meier discusses the Markan version, which he believes to go back to an authentic incident in the life of the historical Jesus.
[76] Cf. above, n. 200 on p. 153.
[77] 4 Macc 7:19; 16:25.
[78] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1301.
[79] Similarly, Abraham is active to receive Lazarus in his bosom in Lk 16:19–31; cf. Green, *Luke*, 722.

There is yet another Lukan addition to the debate, that is the juxtaposition of "the children of this age (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου)" and "the children of God, being children of the resurrection (υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες)." This juxtaposition, together with the present tense of the verbs δύναμαι and εἰμι in v. 36, caused Turid Karlsen Seim to suggest that, whereas Mark and Matthew envision resurrection as a future event, Luke has left the temporal categories at least partly behind.[80] "The children of this age" and "the children of God" closely resemble "the children of this age" and "the children of light" in Lk 16:8 where they refer to two morally different groups, the unrighteous and the righteous. In Seim's view, then, the separation of "the children of this age" and "those worthy of resurrection" is not determined temporally but both groups co-exist. "A selection is already being made and is to be recognised by ethical characteristics."[81] Thus, resurrection for Luke has a present aspect, even though he has not abandoned the idea of a future resurrection either.[82]

Crispin Fletcher-Louis takes one step further. According to him, "those worthy of resurrection" are already taking part in angelomorphic life.[83] The expression ἀνάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν (v. 35) must be understood in a partitive sense;[84] Luke is not anticipating a general resurrection but "a present (spiritual) resurrection of Christians from amongst a dead society."[85] This means that, for Luke, salvation is already experienced within the Christian community. According to Fletcher-Louis, Luke promotes a similar view in the story of the Prodigal Son. The prodigal has also been resurrected from spiritual death, as indicated by the words of the father in Luke 15:24,32: "This son of mine (brother of yours) was dead and lives again; he was lost and is found." This spiritual resurrection is shown in repentance and right behavior, which give a model for all Christians.[86]

---

[80] Seim, *Double Message*, 216–17.
[81] Seim, *Double Message*, 217.
[82] Cf. Ellis, "Fonction (note additionelle)," 301–302.
[83] Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 81–82. As with individual eschatology, such angelomorphic tradition was also well-rooted in pre-Christian Judaism; see the extensive treatment in Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 109–215.
[84] See Plummer, *S. Luke*, 469.
[85] Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 88. For an opposite view, see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1307.
[86] Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 92–93. He points out the correspondence between the wordings "I am no longer worthy to be called your son" (Lk 15:19,21) and "those who are considered worthy of [. . .] resurrection [. . .] are sons [NRSV: children] of God" (Lk 20:35–36).

According to this view, then, besides the collective and the individual view of eschatology, Luke also seems to promote a kind of realized eschatology.[87] In Luke's view, eschatology is partly fulfilled, and the followers of Jesus already participate in the new life. This does not thwart any future expectation. The future parousia, however, ". . . does not bring about a new stage in the establishment of the kingdom, for it is already a reality. Nevertheless, in the future it will be revealed for all to see."[88]

On the basis of the above analysis, it is evident that there are several different aspects to Luke's eschatological expectations. Is there any possibility of combining them in a meaningful way? In part, the whole question may be deemed absurd. Luke is writing for a certain audience in a certain situation, not building a coherent system that would answer all questions for all times. Moreover, "inconsistencies" as defined by present-day readers do not have to be viewed as such by Luke and his audience. The different aspects in Luke's eschatology do not have to be mutually exclusive.[89]

On the other hand, it is fair to assume that Luke intended his work, even though a combination and conflation of different traditions, to form a whole. There are several models for incorporating these views with each other that are worth considering. The first is a harmonistic model. We have examples in other ancient writings of how individual and collective views can be combined into one scheme. The clearest example of this is in 4 Ezra 7.[90] On his otherworldly tour, Ezra asks his guiding angel Uriel whether the souls will rest after death until the last judgment or face retribution immediately (4 Ezra 7:75). According to the angel, both things happen; the dead will first experience preliminary rewards and punishments immediately after death and then face judgment at the end of times,

[87] Others who emphasize the present reality of Luke's eschatological expectation include, e.g., Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 11,15,17,24 and Maddox, *Purpose*, 137–45. This view is refuted by Mattill, *Last Things*, 158–203.

[88] Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 22–23. In Franklin's view, the kingdom is a present, yet transcendent reality. This differs somewhat from the view of Fletcher-Louis who emphasizes the angelomorphic nature of the spiritually resurrected Christians. However, both share the conviction that Luke's special interest is in the present aspect of eschatology.

[89] See Green, *Luke*, 608, n. 343. Similarly Nielsen, according to whom the chronological dimension has excessively dominated the discussion about Luke's eschatology; *Until*, 25.280.

[90] Cf. also *2 Bar.* 29–31.

after which they will be taken to their ultimate destination.[91] It is noteworthy that the author of 4 Ezra also emphasizes that there is no possibility of changing one's fate after death.

The sparse evidence does not allow us to know whether Luke shared a similar view to that of the writer of 4 Ezra. However, there are several arguments that seem to speak against this. These are treated in the next chapter where the question of the fate of the individual after death is taken into closer scrutiny. Another possibility is that Luke envisions a different fate for different people. In other words, those who are counted especially virtuous, such as the patriarchs (cf. Lk 20:37–38) and martyrs (cf. Acts 7:59–60) would be granted entrance into the heavenly bliss immediately while others will have to wait for resurrection at the end of time. In this case, then, Luke would also identify the beggar Lazarus and the penitent thief with martyrs.[92] This, however, is nowhere explicit and thus remains speculative.

There is yet another model of combining the different eschatological strands which also fits well with Luke's view on salvation. Luke was convinced that all those who repented, turned to God, and became members of the Christian community, were saved. This salvation was a present reality and would continue after the end of this world (the realized view). However, for Luke the death of Christians was a fact—there were few (if any) members of the first generation alive in Luke's time. Life still continued, both on earth but also beyond death where the deceased continued their existence (the individual view).[93] At some time in the (probably near) future, God would carry out the final eschatological consummation (the collective view). Those still alive at that moment would naturally not face any individual end but a collective, universal judgment.

Even though this last model seems to best correspond with the evidence, not all passages in Luke's double work fit it smoothly, either. For example, the Q sayings concerning the coming judgment (Lk 10:14; 11:31–32) imply that figures from the past, who died centuries before Jesus' (or Luke's) time, such as the queen of the South and the people of Nineveh, will be judged simultaneously with "this generation." In other words, there is no one model which would

[91] For a more detailed treatment of the passage, see above pp. 138–41.
[92] Cf. Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 192.
[93] Cf. Drury, *Parables*, 112–13.

combine the different aspects of Luke's eschatological thinking into a coherent whole.[94] Whether Luke himself noticed any incoherence between the different views is another question.

These observations indicate that Luke did not aim at constructing an eschatological doctrine. He is more concerned with paraenesis,[95] most expressly in repentance and the right kind of behavior reflecting true penitence. Thus, Luke's Jesus teaches the Galilean towns that they will be judged and condemned (in the future) if they do not repent (Lk 11:31–32) and the Pharisees that they will be judged (immediately) if they do not repent (Lk 16:19–31). As Seim puts it, ". . . the time and hour of the eschaton, whether it be early or late, is of less importance in this perspective."[96]

[94] A similar ambiguity is seen in Paul. For example, in 2 Cor 5:1–10, Paul seems to promote both an individual understanding of eschatology and a collective one; see Lindgård, *Paul's Line of Thought in 2 Corinthians 4:16–5:10*, 222–24. This twofold understanding, which seems incoherent to an analytical reader, does not seem to bother Paul at all and he does not combine them even when he is referring to his personal future.

[95] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 234–35; Seim, *Double Message*, 217.

[96] Seim, *Double Message*, 217.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

# THE FATE OF THE INDIVIDUAL AFTER DEATH

The preceding survey has made clear that scholars do agree on the view that the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus describes an immediate fate after death. However, there is wide disagreement whether this immediate fate is final or only temporary, an intermediate state before the ultimate resurrection. The choice between these two alternatives is made on the basis of the overall understanding of Luke's eschatological view. Those who admit to an individualizing view interpret the respective places of the two men as their final dwellings while those who insist on a collective eschatological consummation see it as an interim abode.

Closely related to this is another question, namely, whether both men are in Hades, albeit in separate departments, or is Hades the subterranean dwelling place of the rich man only while Lazarus and Abraham are in a heavenly realm. Usually scholars who envision Hades as a temporary abode also think that it is for all the dead while those who see Hades as a final dwelling place think that it is for the wicked only. To evaluate the alternatives, we have to take a closer look at what "Hades" means in other contemporary writings and also consider how it relates to other expressions for postmortem destinations Luke uses, such as Gehenna, paradise, "eternal habitations," and others.

## 15.1. Hades—Interim Abode or Final Destiny?

The story is not explicit concerning the nature of Hades.[1] As such, the story seems to support the reading that the men are already at their ultimate destination; ". . . the happiness of the poor man seems

[1] The fact that the rich man raises his eyes (ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς αὐτοῦ; v. 23) is not indicative of his being somewhere below Lazarus. It is a conventional phrase, frequent in the LXX and used by Luke also elsewhere in his gospel (6:20; 18:13). Consider also the "raising of one's voice" in Lk 11:27; Acts 2:14; 14:11; 2:22. The evangelist is clearly fond of Septuagintal style and uses the expressions to imitate the biblical manner of writing. Cf. Cadbury, *Making*, 74; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 114.

to be perfect and final."[2] Lazarus has found the consolation he never enjoyed on earth and the rich man, who has already received his good things on earth, is now tormented. The great chasm seals these fates that can no longer be changed. Nothing indicates that there will be a future judgment and something yet more wonderful or more horrible in store for the men.

However, quite a number of scholars think that Hades, where both the rich man and Lazarus are, is an interim abode. There the souls of the dead reside until the final resurrection.[3] This view is based on a comparison between Luke's description and other ancient accounts. Especially important for these scholars is the description of the different departments of the underworld in *1 Enoch* 22.[4] For example, A.J. Mattill concludes:

> Luke has handed down to us Enoch's popular conception of Hades as a divided intermediate state, with Lazarus in the happy side, which includes Abraham's bosom and the fountain of magical, living water, and Dives in the unhappy side, separated by a great chasm. Here Dives and Lazarus experience preliminary blessing and punishment and await the resurrection, when the souls in Hades will be united with their bodies to stand in the last judgment.[5]

According to this view, Luke understands the fate of the individual after death in similar terms to those of the writers of *1 Enoch* and 4 Ezra who envision the souls of the dead in separate abodes in the underworld where their preliminary conditions anticipate the outcome of the final judgment.[6] This view, however, is entirely based

---

[2] McDannell & Lang, *Heaven*, 28. Similarly Klostermann, *Lukasevangelium* 168; Leaney, *Luke* 226; Schneider, *Lukas*, 341; Nikolainen, *Luukkaan evankeliumi*, 285, Drury, *Parables*, 150; Kremer, *Lukasevangelium*, 165; Peres, *Griechische Grabinschriften*, 126.

[3] Thus Plummer, *S. Luke*, 393–94; Gilmour, *Luke*, 290; Ellis, *Luke*, 206; Ernst, *Lukas*, 474–75; Evans, *St. Luke*, 614; Mattill, *Last Things*, 31–32; Carroll, *Response*, 67; Wiefel, *Lukas*, 299; Marshall, *Luke*, 636; Bernstein, *Formation*, 240, 245–46; Green, *Luke*, 60.

[4] See the text on pp. 130–32.

[5] Mattill, *Last Things*, 31. Cf. Tabor, "Heaven, Ascent to," 93.

[6] Similarly Carroll, *Response*, 65, n. 97. In addition to *1 En.* and 4 Ezra, he refers to *T. Abr.* where the author

> . . . combines the notion of a preliminary judgment following the death of an individual (Abel is cast in the role of the judge) with a final judgment by God (see especially 13:1–8; a third judgment, by the whole of Israel, is thrown in for good measure, thereby meeting the description of three witnesses in Deut 19:15 LXX).

However, the reference to a threefold judgment in the writing is so incidental that it is doubtful whether the author really intends to say that there will be a future judgment at the end of time.

on external evidence; the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus does not seem to support it. The advocates of this view argue that the story does not contradict such a view. The apparent finality of the otherworldly fate in Luke's story is not decisive; the punishments described in *1 Enoch* are also of "seemingly ultimate character."[7] Yet, the explicit reference to the coming judgment (*1 En.* 22:11) makes it clear that they are only preliminary.

Both above-mentioned views, Hades as an interim abode and Hades as a final destiny, are in themselves possible. The problem in deciding between them is that "Hades" is used in both meanings in Jewish writings. In the LXX, it is the most frequent rendering for Sheol, the realm of the dead, which received all the dead and where all were treated indiscriminately.[8] But later Jewish sources, in which a separation of the good and the wicked after death is envisioned, describe Hades as containing separate departments for the just and the unjust. Writings that reflect belief in resurrection naturally envision Hades as a temporary abode. In other texts, the righteous are thought to enjoy heavenly bliss immediately after death. In them, (the often subterranean) Hades is the place of punishment for the wicked only.[9] Different views of Hades sometimes occur within the works of a single author[10] and the same diversity is reflected in different New Testament writings.[11]

---

[7] Carroll, *Response*, 67. Differently Bauckham, who argues that the description of the sinners in *1 En* 22 does not involve torments; "Hades," 14.

[8] Cf. chap. 7.1, pp. 120–21.

[9] For an overview of the concept of Hades in Jewish writings and the New Testament, see Jeremias, "ᾅδης," 146–50 and Bauckham, "Hades," 14–15. However, from today's point of view, the treatment of the topic especially by Jeremias (published in 1933) is presented as a too mechanical, linear scheme. Hades is "first" the abode for all the dead; "then" resurrection belief changed the stay in the underworld into a temporary one and Hades became an interim abode; "then" the idea of retribution after death led to the belief that the good and wicked are separated in the underworld. In the last phase, the adaptation of the Greek belief in immortality transferred the righteous into a heavenly bliss (paradise) and Hades became the place of punishment for the wicked; see pp. 146–47. Such a linear development is hard to prove on the basis of the surviving sources, not least because of the uncertainties involved in dating the sources. It is questionable, for example, whether Hades was ever envisioned as a temporary abode without the idea of the separation of different souls. All we can say is that different (roughly contemporary) writings understand Hades in different ways.

[10] For example, Josephus states that, according to the belief of the Pharisees, the deceased face their punishments and rewards beneath the earth (ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιώσεις τε καὶ τιμάς, *A.J.* 18,1,3). On the other hand, he says that only the wicked enter the darkest Hades; the just ones will be received in heaven where they will be called at the end of time to continue life in cleansed bodies (*B.J.* 3,8.5).

[11] Another shortcoming of Jeremias' article (cf. note 9 above) is his tendency to

Is Hades, then, also an interim abode in Luke 16? The affinities between Luke's account and that of *1 Enoch* 22 are indeed many.[12] Both describe the souls of the good and the wicked separated from each other. *1 Enoch* has four hollow places, Luke speaks of a great chasm. According to both, only the righteous have access to refreshing water while the unrighteous are in agony and pain. The rich man of Luke's story can be seen as an example of those sinners, described in *1 Enoch*, who have not faced judgment on earth.[13] Yet the explicit references to "the great day of judgment" in *1 Enoch* 22 (v. 11; cf. vv. 4 and 13) make it clear that the chapter describes an intermediate state between the death of an individual and the future judgment.[14] Luke, it is argued, likewise envisions Hades as an interim abode with seemingly final conditions.

This argumentation is not thoroughly convincing. First, not all the suggested similarities are equally clear. In addition to those mentioned above, Mattill suggests that, in both accounts, the good and the wicked can see each other.[15] However, this is nowhere explicitly stated in *1 Enoch* 22. Moreover, according to Luke, the blessed and the cursed can also see each other in the final state (cf. Lk 13:28–29), as Mattill himself points out. Carroll, on the other hand, suggests that both *1 Enoch* 22 and Luke 16 contain a reversal of circumstances,[16] but again this is hardly true concerning *1 Enoch* 22. A reversal of conditions and a two-stage judgment are combined in the last chapters of *1 Enoch*,[17] but it lacks the details of the otherworldly geography contained in chapter 22. The views reflected in the different

harmonize the different New Testament views into a single one. He uses such expressions as "the NT agrees" that the stay in Hades is only temporary, and the term thus denotes an interim abode "throughout the NT;" "ᾅδης," 148. More recent treatments have corrected this view; cf., e.g., Tabor: "There is no uniform NT view of the 'state of the dead;'" "Ascent," 93.

[12] See Grensted, "The Use of Enoch," 334; Standen, "Parable," 523; Mattill, *Last Things* 27–31; Carroll, *Response*, 66–67; and most recently Kreitzer, "Luke 16:19–31," 141.

[13] The fact that the burial of the rich man is mentioned has often been seen as underlining the surprising character of the reversal. A great burial was deemed as a sign of righteousness; cf. also the Demotic tale of Setne and the Rabbinic story of the Torah scholars (above, pp. 13–15). However, Luke does not emphasize the point in any way.

[14] This kind of a two-stage scheme is evident also in the Epistle of Enoch, chaps. 91–104; see esp. chaps. 102–104.

[15] Mattill, *Last Things*, 30.

[16] Carroll, *Response*, 67.

[17] Cf. above pp. 175–78.

parts of *1 Enoch*, originating in different centuries, should not be harmonized into one view.

The basic difference between *1 Enoch* 22 and Luke 16 is expressly the fact that, while the former speaks of a two-stage judgment, preliminary punishment in an interim abode and a final verdict at the end of time, the latter does not. It is possible that Luke has envisioned a similar two-stage structure but it is far from certain. Even though the imagery used is very similar (as I have myself argued extensively in chap. 7), Luke may have used it with another function, i.e., he may have applied the imagery describing an intermediate fate in *Enoch* to the final destiny.

The other references to Hades in Luke's double work do not cast much light on the use of the term in the Rich Man and Lazarus. In addition to Luke 16:23, "Hades" occurs only three other times in the entire double work.[18] The only other occurrence of the word in the gospel is in the rebuke against Capernaum, a part of Jesus' mission speech to the seventy (Lk 10:15): "And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades" (εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ). The passage is from Q and Luke seems to have preserved its wording quite faithfully.[19] The verse alludes to Isa 14:13–15 where the prophet rebukes the king of Babylonia for arrogance:

> You said in your heart, "I will ascend to heaven; I will raise my throne above the stars of God; I will sit on the mount of assembly on the heights of Zaphon; I will ascend to the tops of the clouds, I will make myself like the Most High." But you are brought down to Sheol [LXX: εἰς ᾅδου καταβήσῃ], to the depths of the Pit.

What is the idea behind the word in this context? Going down to Hades denotes Capernaum's disgrace but can anything else be inferred from the passage? It seems clear that Isaiah simply speaks of the opposition between high and low, heaven and the netherworld, Sheol. In the Septuagint, where שְׁאוֹל is translated as Hades, the term still seems to be used in a geographical sense without any reference to punishment. The parallelism in v. 15, where Hades is paralleled,

[18] On the other hand, these four cases are more than the references to Hades in Mark (no occurrences) and Matthew (two occurrences). In addition to these, the word appears only in Rev (four occurrences).

[19] The verse is practically *verbatim* with its parallel in Mt 11:23a. See *The Critical Edition of Q*, 186–87.

according to the LXX, with "the foundations of the earth" (εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς), seems to indicate a neutral place of the dead, not a place of punishment.[20] However, it remains unclear whether the term is used in the same fashion in the Q saying. The immediate context (cf. Lk 10:13–14) speaks of judgment for Chorazin and Bethsaida. Analogously, it might be argued that judgment also awaits Capernaum. In Matthew's version, this becomes evident, for there Jesus continues his reproach of Capernaum by comparing it with Sodom: "For if the deeds of power done in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I tell you that on the day of judgment it will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom than for you" (Mt 11:23b–24). Those commentators who favor the Matthean longer version as the original one explain the Lukan omission due to his inclination to avoid reduplication (cf. the mention of Sodom in Lk 10:12).[21] Be that as it may, the reference to Hades in Lk 10:15 does not reveal anything concerning its temporal character, ether temporary or final.[22]

The two occurrences of "Hades" in Acts are less ambiguous. Both appear in a Psalm citation and denote a Hebrew Bible sense of the word (Acts 2:27,31). In his Pentecostal speech, Peter refers to King David and cites Psalm 16 (Ps 15 in the LXX): "For you will not abandon my soul to Hades, or let your Holy One experience corruption."[23] He then interprets the Psalm as speaking of Christ, to whom the word "holy one" (ὅσιος) refers: "Foreseeing this, David spoke of the resurrection of the Messiah, saying, 'He was not abandoned to Hades, nor did his flesh experience corruption.'" (v. 31). Thus, the passage speaks of the fate of Christ, not of the fate of ordinary mortals. In the same context, in v. 34, Peter denies that David ascended into heaven (as Christ did). This makes it natural to infer that David's soul is also in Hades, which is here understood as the realm of all the dead. This would mean that Luke uses the word Hades in different senses in his double work. Whereas Luke 16:23 depicts Hades as a place of torment (or at least containing a punitive department), Acts 2:27,31 reflect the Hebrew Bible rendering

[20] *Contra* Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 855.
[21] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 851.
[22] *Contra* Mattill, *Last Things*, 31.
[23] The word "corruption" (διαφθορά) may be understood in a concrete sense: God does not allow the body of Christ to decay; cf. Acts 13:34–37; Harder, "φθείρω," 104.

of a neutral abode of all the dead.[24] Lk 10:15 remains ambiguous in this respect.

### *Hades and Gehenna*

The conceptualizing of Hades as a place of punishment comes close to the meaning of Gehenna, the place of eschatological punishment for the wicked.[25] The word Gehenna is not very common; it occurs twelve times in the New Testament. Ten of these are in either Matthew (7) or in Mark (3).[26] According to them, Gehenna is a place into which an unquenchable fire is burning and to which the wicked will be thrown to be punished forever.[27] Often scholars assume that there is a sharp distinction between Hades and Gehenna in the New Testament.[28] According to this view, Hades refers to the interim abode before the judgment and is then replaced by Gehenna as the place of final punishment. This, however, is far from certain. The

---

[24] Cf. Bauckham, "Hades," 15.

[25] The word is a Greek form of the Hebrew name Valley of Hinnom (גֵּי־הִנֹּם; an abbreviation of the longer form גֵּי בֶן־הִנֹּם or גֵּי בְנֵי הִנֹּם; e.g., in Josh 15:8; 18:16; Neh 11:30). This name was given to a valley south of Jerusalem where, according to the Hebrew Bible, sacrifices were offered to Moloch during the reign of Ahaz and Manasseh (Jer 7:31; 19:1–5; 32:35; cf. 2 Kgs 16:3; 21:6). For this reason, Jeremiah laments over it and calls it the "Valley of Slaughter" where God makes the inhabitants of Jerusalem fall by the swords of their enemies and where the dead will be buried or even left unburied (Jer 7:32; 19:6–9). The prophet does not associate the valley with fire but later these images, the sacrificial fires, the dead bodies, and the wrath of God, were assimilated into one fiery place of punishment for the dead. See Jeremias, "γέεννα," 655; Watson, "Gehenna," 927.

[26] See Mk 9:43,45,47; Mt 5:22,29,30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15,33. In addition, Matthew often refers to eschatological unquenchable fire; Mt 3:10,12; 7:19; 13:40,42,50; 18:8; 25:41; cf. the "eternal punishment (κόλασις αἰώνιος)" in 25:46.

[27] In addition to these New Testament references, the Greek γέεννα (and its Latin equivalent Gehenna) only occurs in the Pseudepigrapha (and later Christian literature). The word does not occur in the LXX, or Philo, or Jospehus; Watson, "Gehenna," 926–27. The earliest reference to an eschatological place of punishment is in *1 En.* 27. It describes an "accursed valley" (φάραγξ κεκατηραμένη) outside the temple of Jerusalem but does not speak of fire. In another part of *1 Enoch*, the so-called Animal Apocalypse, those who are condemned at the judgment are thrown into a fiery abyss but the place is not associated with any geographical location (*1 En.* 90:24–27; cf. *1 En.* 54:1–6). The name Gehenna appears only in later writings, such as 4 Ezra 7:36; *2 Bar.* 59:10; *2 En.* 40:12; 42:1; *Sib. Or.* 1,103; 2,292; 4,186. Practically all these passages associate fire with Gehenna; the only exceptions are *2 En.* 40–42 and *Sib. Or.* 4,186.

[28] Jeremias, "ᾅδης," 148; "γέεννα," 655; Watson, "Gehenna," 927 (with perhaps Lk 12:5 being an exception; see further below); Bernstein, *Formation*, 234; Powyss, *Hell*, 286.

words never occur within the same context and thus their relationship to each other remains obscure.

The Book of Revelation, which is the only NT writing that speaks explicitly of the temporary character of Hades, most closely represents this view. However, "Gehenna" does not occur anywhere in the writing. According to the description, Death and Hades (being no doubt rough equivalents; cf. 1:18; 6:8) will be thrown into "the lake of fire" together with all those whose names are not found in the book of life (Rev 20:13–14). The fiery lake is, of course, close to the concept of Gehenna but it is noteworthy that it is called "the second death." This probably implies destruction; the wicked will cease to live while the righteous will enjoy a blessed life in the renewed world, where there will be no more death. The only ones who are tormented forever in the lake of fire are Satan, the beast, and the false prophet (20:10). On the other hand, the vision in Rev 14 seems to imply an eternal torment in fire for all who "worship the beast and its image, and receive a mark on their foreheads or on their hands" (14:9–11). It seems that the author of the book of Revelation, too, uses different kinds of images. When the world comes to its end, Hades has fulfilled its function and is destroyed in a fiery lake together with the opponents of God.

However, the only New Testament texts that speak of both Hades and Gehenna, the gospels of Matthew and Luke, never contrast these two and thus do not necessarily share the expectations of the author of Revelation. It is clear that "Gehenna" for Matthew is the place of eternal punishment after the judgment but he does not speculate on the fate of the souls between death and the last judgment. "Hades" occurs twice in his gospel; in addition to the rebuke of Capernaum (Mt 11:23; cf. above), he refers once to the "gates of Hades" (Mt 16:18). Nothing is said about any temporary character of Hades or about its relation with Gehenna.

In Luke's double work, the only occurrence of "Gehenna" is in Luke 12:4–5. There Jesus exhorts his disciples: "I tell you, my friends, do not fear those who kill the body, and after that can do nothing more. But I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has authority to cast into Gehenna" [NRSV: Hell]. Luke's version differs somewhat from its Matthean parallel (Mt 10:28) where Jesus tells the disciples to fear him who "can destroy both soul and body in hell." Most scholars assume that the wording in Matthew

is closer to the original.[29] The two versions have been extensively treated by Chaim Milikowski,[30] according to whom Matthew and Luke understand the word Gehenna differently. Luke does not say that the soul is destroyed or that the bodies are cast into Gehenna. Moreover, by separating the killing of the body and the casting (of the soul) into Gehenna, he has modified the traditional understanding of Gehenna as a physical, eschatological hell into an intermediate state where the souls are received immediately after death. In other words, Matthew believes that both the body and the soul are cast into Gehenna after the judgment while Luke thinks that only the soul is punished and this punishment begins immediately after death. Thus, there is no difference between Luke's understanding of Gehenna in 12:5 and that of Hades in 16:23.

This reconstruction is, again, possible but far from certain. It places extreme emphasis on the single occurrence of "Gehenna" in Luke. Moreover, it relies too heavily on the assumption that Luke has deliberately altered the original wording of his source. It may well be that the Matthean wording is closer to the original but it is questionable what conclusions can be drawn from this observation. It is also true that Milikowski's reading is in accord with the rest of Luke-Acts but this is only perhaps due to the fact that there are no other references to Gehenna in the double work. Milikowski finds support for his view in the fact that Luke has omitted the only Markan reference to Gehenna that speaks of bodies being cast into the fire (Mk 9:43–48). However, it is uncertain whether the omission is actually due to the bodily expression used in Mark. This is unlikely; the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus shows that Luke himself has no problems in depicting the otherworldly torments in fire in bodily terms. Like Hades, also Gehenna, then, is an ambiguous word and can be used with different meanings.[31] Thus, it is possible that Luke

---

[29] The whole section Lk 12:2–9 derives from Q (par. Mt 10:26–33); see *The Critical Edition of Q*, 290–307. Luke's treatment of the topic in vv. 4–5 is more elaborate than the Matthean verse (10:28), which is probably due to Luke's redaction; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 956; Milikowski, "Which Gehenna," 242.

[30] Milikowski, "Which Gehenna," 241–43. Cf. Watson, "Gehenna," 927.

[31] In the Rabbinic literature, "Gehenna" stands for both the final place of punishment where the sinners are sent with their souls and bodies after the judgment and a place of immediate retribution after death, an abode for the souls only. In the latter case, Gehenna is sometimes understood as an interim abode; see Milikowski, "Which Gehenna," 239–40.

understands Hades and Gehenna as rough equivalents denoting the place of punishment for the wicked immediately after death. There are, however, no definite answers on how Luke related these concepts to the future judgment and the final destiny of the wicked—or whether he related them at all.[32]

In addition to "Hades" and "Gehenna," Luke also uses some other related expressions. The word ἄβυσσος is found once in his double work (Lk 8:31). The word is a rough equivalent of Hades,[33] sometimes denoting the realm of the dead.[34] However, the context in which it occurs in the gospel, the story of the curing of the demon-possessed in Gerasa (parr. Mk 5:12; Mt 8:31),[35] does not speak of the fate of the dead. The demons beg Jesus not to throw them into the "abyss," which places emphasis on its subterranean character, the bowels of earth where spirits are imprisoned.

Another related word that Luke also uses only once is "perdition" (ἀπώλεια; Acts 8:20). The word occurs in the synoptic tradition both in a concrete sense ("waste" in the anointment story Mk 14:4; par. Mt 26:8; Luke has omitted the story) and in a metaphoric sense ("eternal perdition;" Mt 7:13; contrast Lk 13:24). In the passage in Acts, Luke uses the word in the latter sense when Peter condemns Simon Magus to perdition with his money. The word connotes not only the cessation of existence but also eternal punishment.[36]

What, then, can be inferred from Luke's use of these different words? How is the Lukan Hades related to the Lukan Gehenna? The difficulty in answering these questions arises from the fact that

[32] According to Milikowski, Luke does not have any true doctrine of hell; "Which Gehenna," 243. Cf. Powyss, according to whom there is no idea of eternal punishment in the New Testament; *Hell*, 414–16. In his view, the most common image for depicting the fate of the unrighteous in Luke (and in other synoptic tradition) is rejection and destruction; pp. 284–89. The "weeping and the gnashing of teeth" in Lk 13:22–29 (and several Matthean passages) does not denote punishment as such but the reaction of those who find themselves rejected. However, it is doubtful whether these different concepts—rejection, destruction, and punishment—can be separated from each other in any clear-cut way. Cf. Bernstein, who points out that destruction and eternal punishment are not always mutually exclusive; *Formation*, 193–99. For example, in *L.A.B.* 16:3 the fiery punishment is also called "the place of destruction."

[33] Jeremias, "ἄβυσσος," 9.

[34] The word occurs in this sense in Rom 10:7; cf *Jub*. 2:2.

[35] The parallel passages do not contain the word ἄβυσσος which thus is a Lukan addition to his source.

[36] Oepke, "ἀπόλλυμι," 396. In this sense, the word also occurs in John 17:12; Rom 9:22; Phil 1:28; 3:19; Heb 10:39; 2 Pet 3:7; Rev 17:8.

Luke has so few references to both Hades and Gehenna. The words never occur in the same context and thus any reconstruction remains speculative. What is fairly certain is that Luke uses the word Hades both in the Hebrew Bible sense of the abode of all the dead and as containing a place of torment for the wicked. However, hardly anything can be said concerning the temporality or finality of the punishments in Hades.

In my view, the description of the rich man's fiery agony in Luke's story points more to a final, not a temporary punishment. It is worth noting that neither *1 Enoch* 22 nor 4 Ezra associate fire with preliminary punishment. The former speaks vaguely of "great pain," the latter of wandering in confusion without rest in the chambers. Despite this, it is, of course, possible that Luke envisioned the fiery punishment as preliminary. However, the words of Abraham in v. 25 concerning Lazarus' consolation "here" seem to indicate a permanent, not just a temporary bliss. Naturally, a future resurrection would not take away the bliss, the consolation would continue, but presumably not "here." Moreover, the idea that somebody would return from the dead probably does not imply a return from an intermediate state but from the final destiny.[37] None of the other numerous ancient stories that depict a messenger from the world of the dead speaks of an intermediate state.

These considerations favor the reading of the Rich Man and Lazarus as describing a final destiny. This is, strictly speaking, in contradiction with some other images Luke uses. However, it seems both forced and unnecessary to combine these different images. The point he is making in each case is most important for him, and the eschatological image serves this point. In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the point is the reversal and its finality. Two different destinies await people after death. Those who do not repent will face the worse alternative. After death, it is too late to repent. Luke has no need of the concepts of future judgment and universal resurrection in order to make this point. A similar discrepancy also emerges between the different images Luke uses for the good lot of the righteous.

[37] Cf. Evans, *Saint Luke*, 614.

## 15.2. The Good Lot of the Righteous

The good lot of Lazarus is described as "consolation" in "Abraham's bosom." The man who did not find shelter or nourishment in his life on earth enjoys a honorary position and protection with the companionship of the patriarch.[38] But where is "Abraham's bosom?" Is it a separate department in Hades, as those advocating the intermediate reading argue, or in heaven? The expression does not occur elsewhere in Luke's double work (or the New Testament or Jewish literature).[39] Presumably Luke did not envision it as a separate place, like Hades or Gehenna or paradise, but the expression simply denotes an intimate fellowship with Abraham.[40] But where is this fellowship taking place? The discussion concerning Hades showed that there can be no definitive answer as to whether Abraham and Lazarus are on "the happy side" of Hades or not.

Along with "Abraham's bosom," Luke uses another obscure term, the "eternal habitations" (Lk 16:9). Scholars agree that the expression has an eschatological connotation[41] but its finer meaning is disputed. This phrase is not found anywhere else in the New Testament

[38] Cf. above pp. 214–19.

[39] The term occurs in some later writings. In *T. Ab. A* 20, God declares to the angels who escort Abraham to the hereafter: "Take, therefore, my friend Abraham, to paradise, where there are the tents (σκηναί) of my righteous ones and the mansions (μοναί) of my holy ones, Isaac and Jacob, in his bosom (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ), where there is no suffering, no grief, no moaning, but peace and exultation, and endless life." This odd description places Abraham's bosom (together with Abraham's descendents) in paradise *before* the death of Abraham. It is quite likely that the expression is derived from Luke's example story, especially as the other terms used also reflect Christian usage (σκηναί cf. Lk 16,9; Rev 13:6; 21:3; μοναί cf. John 14:2). The description of paradise also resembles the conditions in the New Jerusalem in Rev 21:4: "Death will be no more; mourning and crying and pain will be no more." Another late occurrence of the expression "Abraham's bosom" is in the Babylonian Talmud where the term חיקו של אברהם is used; *bQidd.* 72a–b. Freedman translates the passage (in the Soncino edition): "There is a Fort Agama in Babylon wherein dwells Adda b. Ahabah: to-day he sits in Abraham's lap." The interpretation is far from certain; some understand it as a euphemism for death, others as reference to circumcision. Both readings have problems; see Cave, "Lazarus," 323.

[40] According to Jülicher, "Abraham's bosom" is not the place where all the righteous will be received but a special reward for Lazarus alone; *Gleichnisreden 2*, 625: "All dwellers of Hades are hardly imposed to similar pain, and not all dwellers of Paradise are in Abraham's bosom; the latter presumes the highest, the former the lowest position." (My translation.) This reading is possible but not certain.

[41] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1110.

or in earlier or contemporary extra-biblical writings.[42] Another name for the place for the blessed is paradise (Lk 23:43). Contrary to the other two, it is a well-known word in contemporary Jewish literature for denoting eschatological hope.[43] But like Gehenna, each of these three terms occur only once in the whole double work, which complicates their understanding considerably. In addition to these three expressions, I will briefly consider other related terms, the kingdom of God, eternal life, and heaven.

### *Paradise*

Is Abraham—and Lazarus in his bosom—in paradise?[44] If he is, how does the description of Luke 16:22–26 relate to the only reference to paradise in the gospel, in Jesus' promise to the repentant thief on the cross: "Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in paradise" (Lk 23:43). The identification of the dwelling place of Abraham and Lazarus with paradise seems justified, as both the Rich Man and Lazarus and the story of the repentant thief refer to the fate of the individual immediately after death. It is unlikely that Luke would envision various separate abodes for those who are destined for the blessed life after death. The questions remain, though, whether the stay in paradise is temporary and thus only for the intermediate period between death and resurrection, or eternal; and whether it is situated in Hades (in the underworld) or in heaven.

The idea of an eschatological paradise has its roots in the Hebrew Bible. The garden of Eden is not only the primeval paradise whose glory is lost to humankind,[45] but it is also associated with the future

[42] It does occur in the additional second chapter of 4 Ezra (= 2 Esdras 2:11) but this is a late composition, perhaps from the second or the third century C.E.; Bergren, *Sixth Ezra: The Text and Origin*, 7. Thus it is likely to reflect Lk 16:9. Cf. above n. 39 concerning the occurrence of αἰώνιοι σκηναί in *T. Abr. A* 20:14.

[43] The roots of the word "paradise" are well-known; see the comprehensive study on the origin of the word in Bremmer, "Paradise: From Persia, via Greece into the *Septuagint*," esp. pp. 1–17. In the Hebrew Bible the word occurs always in a secular sense, denoting "garden" or "orchard" (Neh 2:8; Song 4:13; Eccl 2:5). "Paradise" acquired a more religious connotation in the LXX where the Greek equivalent of the term, παράδεισος, was used for the garden in Eden (Gen 2:8–10,16), i.e., the garden of God (Ezek 28:13 and 31:8–9); see Jeremias, "παράδεισος," 763; Charlesworth, "Paradise," 154.

[44] Thus, e.g., Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden 2*, 623; Mattill, *Last Things*, 34; Bauckham, "Hades," 15.

[45] As in Gen 13:10; Ezek 28:11–19; 31:6–9,16–18; Joel 2:3.

restoration of God's people. According to the prophets, the Lord will make the desolate and ruined land ". . . like Eden, like the garden of the Lord" (Isa 51:3; Ezek 36:33–35).[46] Paradisiac images, such as the absence of any trouble or toil, great fruitfulness and abundant water, peace, longevity and intimate and close fellowship with God, are also used for the prosperity of God's people without an explicit reference to Eden,[47] often in association with eschatological hope.[48]

However, the identification of the original (and later lost) paradise and the eschatological paradise is explicit only in the pseudepigrapha. The earliest reference to the "paradise of righteousness" in *1 Enoch* 32 remains ambiguous in this respect[49] but in later writings, the identification of the two becomes evident. For example, according to the *Apocalypse of Moses*, God promises to give the earthly paradise back to the righteous after the resurrection and to dwell in their midst (*Apoc. Mos.* 13:2–4). Similarly, according to the *Testament of Levi*:

> He will open the gates of paradise and remove the sword that is threatening from Adam on, and he will allow the holy ones to eat from the tree of life, and the spirit of holiness will be upon them (*T. Levi* 18:10).[50]

[46] Isaiah speaks of the restoration of Zion and, in later Jewish literature, Eden is related to Jerusalem and its (future) temple. This is most obvious in *Jub.* where Eden is called "the Holy of Holies and the dwelling of the Lord" (8:19; cf. 3:8–12) but the same association is found also in *1 En.* 24–25, *T. Dan* 5:12; *L.A.E.* 29:1–6 and some Qumran texts. See van Ruiten, "Eden and the Temple," 75–79.

[47] Ps 1:1–3; 92:13; Isa 44:3–4; Jer 17:7–8.

[48] Isa 11:6–9; 35:1–2,6–7,9–10; 41:18–19; 58:11; 65:20–25; Ezek 47:7–12; Joel 3:18; Amos 9:13; Hos 2:20–24; Zech 8:3–8; 14:6–8. Cf. Jeremias, "παράδεισος," 764 n. 15; Charlesworth, "Paradise," 154.

[49] On his cosmic journey, Enoch sees in the far east the "paradise of righteousness" (παράδεισος τῆς δικαιοσύνης; *1 En.* 32:3). There are many fragrant and beautiful trees there, among them "the tree of knowledge" from which Adam and Eve ate. However, it is more likely that this description only refers to the original paradise where the first people dwelt and has no specific eschatological overtones; see Tigchelaar, "Eden and Paradise," 40–42. A little earlier in the Book of the Watchers (*1 En.* 25), Enoch sees the "tree of life" in another place, at the throne of God. This, he is told, will be replanted on earth for the righteous after the judgment. This seems to refer to a new, earthly paradise where the righteous will enjoy long lives as did the antediluvian fathers.

[50] Cf. *T. Dan* 5:12 and the more obscure references to paradise in *Apoc. Ab.* 21:6; *L.A.B.* 19:10–13 (and also 3:10 even though the word "paradise" is not mentioned); *Ps. Sol.* 14:2–3. Eden also serves as one of the models for the New Jerusalem in Rev 21–22.

If the original paradise is restored at the end of time, it must exist somewhere all along.[51] Many texts locate this hidden paradise on earth.[52] For example, Eve and Seth can walk to paradise to fetch oil for the anointment of the sick Adam after their expulsion from there (*L.A.E.* 40). According to Pseudo-Philo, paradise existed at the time of the establishment of the covenant on Mount Sinai (*L.A.B.* 32:8; cf. *Jub.* 4:24; 8:16,21). The Similitudes of Enoch also seems to describe an earthly paradise (*1 En.* 60:8,23–25; 61:12; 70) even though Enoch is raised up when taken into paradise. Other writings, however, state that paradise is being stored in heaven by God (*Apoc. Mos.* 37:5–6; 40:1; *2 Bar.* 4:2–6; 2 Cor 12:2–4), most often in the third heaven.[53]

No matter where the paradise is located, it is reserved for the dwelling place of the righteous. Often the restoration of paradise is depicted as taking place after the final judgment and resurrection. This is evident, e.g., in the description in 4 Ezra. "The paradise of delight" and its opposite, "the furnace of Gehenna," will be revealed at the judgment.[54] Characteristics of this reopened paradise are "incorruptible fruit," "abundance," and "healing," and the tree of life.[55] Despite the concrete, earthly images of trees and fruit adopted from the Biblical traditions, the eschatological paradise is not situated on earth in several texts.[56] Most references to paradise do not give a specific location for it, but some clearly describe a heavenly place.[57]

---

[51] Jeremias, "παράδεισος," 764.

[52] According to Hilhorst, the belief in the continued existence of paradise never died out; "A Visit to Paradise: *Apocalypse of Paul* 45 and Its Background," 134–36. Often it was thought of as being somewhere on earth. In the Genesis story, Lot looks around the Jordan plain which is "irrigated everywhere [. . .] like the garden of the Lord or the land of Egypt (Gen 13:10)." In Hilhorst's view, these two are "bracketed together in such a way that we can hardly suppose that the one (Paradise) is lost while the other (Egypt) exists." (p. 135.)

[53] Thus, e.g., in *2 En.* 8–9. However, in *2 En.* 42:3 [recension J] the hidden paradise is situated on earth; it is "open as far as the third heaven but closed off from this world" (trans. by Andersen in *OTP 1*). The last sentence might be a later interpolation in order to harmonize the different locations of paradise.

[54] 4 Ezra 7:36; cf. *2 Bar.* 51:7–12; *T. Levi* 18:10; *T. Dan* 5:12; *2 En.* 9; 42:3–5; 65:8–10. All these texts seem to imply that the righteous enter paradise after the judgment. Paradise and Gehenna are also contrasted in 4 Ezra 4:7–8 (see the quotation in n. 57 below).

[55] 4 Ezra 7:123; 8:52. Cf. Rev 22.

[56] *Contra* Jeremias, "παράδεισος," 765, n. 18.

[57] Cf. 4 Ezra 4:7–8:

> He said to me: If I had asked you "How many habitations are in the heart of the sea, or how many streams are in the source of the abyss, or how many

In other texts, the righteous are taken into paradise immediately at death—or instead of death, as in the case of Enoch.[58] In these cases, paradise is situated in heaven.[59]

Thus, the eschatological paradise is the blessed place of the righteous after death, but the writers of different texts understand it somewhat differently. Some locate it on earth and imagine it to be opened for the righteous only after the judgment. In these texts, the fate of the righteous immediately after death is not an issue. Others locate paradise in heaven. In some of these, paradise exists all along, ready to receive the righteous but this happens only at the end of time; in others, the righteous enter it immediately after death.[60]

What, then, might Luke have meant by "paradise" in Jesus' words to the repentant thief (23:43)? It is difficult to answer the question given the diversity of meanings attached to the word in extra-biblical literature and the fact that the verse is the only instance where Luke uses it.[61] In addition to Luke 23:43, "paradise" occurs only twice elsewhere in the whole NT corpus. Paul uses it when describing his rapture in the third heaven where he heard "things that are not to be told" (2 Cor 12:2–4). For him, then, paradise seems to be a

---

> ways are above the firmament, or which are the exits of paradise", you would have perhaps said to me, "I never descended into the abyss, nor yet into the underworld (*in infernum*), nor did I ever ascend to heaven."

The contrast between the abyss and paradise on the one hand and he underworld and heaven on the other suggests that paradise is located in heaven. Similarly, *2 Baruch* says that paradise (and the temple) is stored in the abode of God (4:2–6). When paradise will be revealed to the righteous after the judgment, they will become like angels, which also implies a heavenly paradise (51:7–12). Even though "Baruch" also describes an eschatological, earthly paradise before the consummation of the ages (29:5–8), he does not use the word "paradise." Cf. *2 En.* 8–9; *3 Bar.* 10; *Apoc. Mos.* 37:5–6; 40:1; *T. Ab.* A 10:11; 20:14.

[58] Enoch is taken into paradise according to *1 En.* 60:8; 70; Adam in *Apoc. Mos.* 37:5–6; 40:1, and Abraham in *T. Ab. A* 20:14. In both of the latter texts, it is the archangel Michael who conducts the soul of the dead patriarch into paradise. According to *T. Ab. A* 10:11, all the righteous souls are taken into paradise immediately after death.

[59] Cf. also *T. Job* 12:8–9. There the soul of Job is taken upward upon a chariot towards the east, presumably to a heavenly paradise even though the word is not used.

[60] In *Apoc. Mos.*, these different aspects are combined. Before the day of judgment, paradise is in heaven and the soul of Adam is taken there to wait for the judgment (37:5–6; 40:1). After the end of this world, the paradise with the tree of life will be given to the righteous who will dwell there with God (13:4). This will presumably take place on earth, even though the text is not quite explicit.

[61] Cf. Carroll, *Response*, 69.

present reality situated in heaven[62] but it remains unclear whether he imagines the righteous dwelling there.[63]

The third occurrence of the word is in Revelation where the faithful in the church of Ephesus are promised that they will ". . . eat from the tree of life that is in the paradise of God" (Rev 2:7). This undoubtedly refers to the final reward at the end of time, as a comparison with the promises given to the faithful in the six other churches shows.[64] Is this paradise situated in heaven or on earth?[65] It seems likely that the author pictures paradise as a heavenly realm that will be restored on earth after the judgment.[66] This would make paradise analogous to the temple of the New Jerusalem that "comes down from my God out of heaven" (cf. the reward of the faithful in Philadelphia described in 3:12). The same applies to the reward of the faithful in Laodicea who are promised that they will be seated with Jesus on his throne (3:21). All these images are combined in the description of the final bliss in Rev 21–22. The New Jerusalem comes down from heaven (21:2) and God dwells among his people (21:3–4) with Jesus sitting on the throne (21:5). Even though the New Jerusalem is described as a city, "the river of the water of life" flows through the middle of the streets with "the tree of life" growing

[62] Paul seems to indicate that paradise is situated in the third heaven. However, not all scholars read the text that way. According to Jeremias, it is not certain whether Paul's rapture in the third heaven in v. 2 is the same as that into paradise in v. 4; "παράδεισος," 768. In a similar way, Tabor suggests that Paul is describing a two-stage ascent, first to the third heaven and then to paradise, the throne of God, which is situated in the highest (presumably seventh) heaven; *Things Unutterable*, 119–21. In his reading, Paul's Corinthian opponents boasted about such ecstatic experiences as raptures in the third heaven (cf. 2 Cor 10:12) and Paul here wishes to outdo them. Tabor's suggestion is interesting but rests on sheer speculation. It is quite likely that, despite the redundant style of 1 Cor 12:2–4, Paul locates paradise in the third heaven, as do the writers of *2 En., 3 Bar.*, and *Apoc. Mos.* Thus also Aejmelaeus, *Schwachheit*, 233–39.

[63] According to Tabor, paradise for Paul is not the dwelling place of the righteous but the throne of God; *Things Unutterable*, 118–19. In his view, Paul pictures the dead in the underworld from where they will rise to meet Christ in the air; 1 Thess 4:13–18. However, it is also possible that Paul was no more consistent in his afterlife imagery than Luke. But even if Paul envisioned paradise as the destination of the righteous, it remains unclear whether they are already there or will dwell there only after the parousia.

[64] Cf. Rev 2:11,17,26; 3:5,12,21.

[65] The reference to the tree of life as such does not necessarily denote an earthly paradise (cf. 4 Ezra 8:52).

[66] Cf. *2 Bar.* 4:2–6.

on either side of it (22:1–2).[67] It is probable that Luke also understands paradise as the final abode for the righteous that, at least for the time being, is situated in heaven. However, in his view, the righteous will enter paradise immediately after death. In other words, understood in this way, Jesus promises the repentant thief that he will join him in heaven immediately at death. This would correspond to the fate of Stephen (Acts 7:55–56,59–60; cf. above pp. 253–54).

This view has been considered problematic since Jesus' promise of being with the thief "today" contrasts with the idea of future resurrection and the belief that it was only on the third day that Jesus rose from the dead.[68] One way to solve this apparent contradiction is to understand the "today" in other than a calendrical sense. According to this view, σήμερον does not refer to the day of crucifixion but denotes the "now" of messianic salvation.[69] Another solution, sometimes combined with the first one, is to interpret "paradise" as an interim abode for the righteous where they await the future resurrection.[70] In the words of A.J. Mattill:

> To Jesus Luke 23:43 may have meant that he and the thief would ascend that day to the heavenly Paradise, such as is depicted by Paul and the Secrets of Enoch,[71] possibly as a reward for martyrdom. But Luke would not have thought of the heavenly Paradise, for according to Acts 2:27,31 [. . .] Jesus did not ascend immediately to heaven but went to Hades to await the resurrection and ascension. If Luke had conceived of Paradise as being above, he at Luke 16:22 would probably have referred to Lazarus' being taken *up* into Paradise, as Paul tells of his "being caught *up* into Paradise" (2 Cor 12:4), or as Enoch relates that the angels took him *up* to the third heaven (Secrets of Enoch 8:1). Here it is most likely that Luke conceived of Paradise, like Abraham's bosom, as being in the happy side of Hades, the intermediate state.[72]

John T. Carroll understands the time frame differently but ends up with the same conclusion: paradise is an interim abode in the realm of the dead. He concludes:

---

[67] Cf. *Apoc. Mos.* 13:4.
[68] Maddox, *Purpose*, 104.
[69] Ellis, "Present and Future," 36–37; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1510.
[70] Jeremias, "παράδεισος," 766.
[71] Meaning *2 Enoch*.
[72] Mattill, *Last Things*, 34.

> If "Paradise" here refers to the interim residence of the souls of the righteous dead before the parousia, then Jesus' saying must mean "today" (calendrically), for Jesus would soon be raised up from the realm of the dead, then exalted to heaven. Thereafter the criminal would no longer be "with Jesus" until the end-time. If "Paradise" does not have end-time bliss but rather interim refreshment for its content, then Jesus' point in v 43 would be: "You need not wait until the establishment of my kingly rule to enjoy the blessings of God in fellowship with me. This very day we will be together in the (temporary) abode of the righteous."[73]

Such an interpretation of the Lukan paradise as an interim abode is problematic. Mattill's argument is circular as he presupposes that Lazarus—in Luke 16:22—is in paradise. Moreover, none of the Jewish texts that speak of paradise locate it in the underworld.[74] Those texts that speak both of underworld chambers where the souls wait to be resurrected and of paradise, always identify paradise as the final abode of the righteous where they are taken after the judgment (*1 Enoch*, 4 Ezra, *2 Baruch*). In regard to Carroll's attempt to harmonize the Lukan views, it must be said that his reading has no support from the text. There is nothing in the story of Jesus and the repentant thief that would justify the rather awkward claim that Jesus promises the thief only a temporary fellowship (of two days!) and a continuation of this only after the last judgment. Jesus' words can hardly denote anything other than unending communion with him, starting from today.[75]

Actually, paradise is never described as only an interim abode even though scholars often regard it as such.[76] In extra-biblical Jewish literature, paradise is the place for the righteous. In some writings, the righteous enter it immediately after death but clearly to be there forever, not just to wait for resurrection. This is also true of the writings that combine the individual salvation at death and the future resurrection, such as the *Apocalypse of Moses*. There "paradise" denotes both the heavenly place where Adam is taken immediately after death and the future bliss of the righteous after judgment. However, it is one and the same paradise all along, the primeval habitation of Adam and Eve, which is transposed to heaven to receive the righteous

[73] Carroll, *Response*, 68, n. 112. Cf. also Goulder, *New Paradigm*, 636.
[74] Jeremias, "παράδεισος," 768, n. 52.
[75] Haufe, "Individuelle Eschatologie des Neuen Testaments," 442.
[76] Thus, e.g., Charlesworth, "Paradise," 154; Carroll, *Response*, 67.

at death, and which will be transferred back to the newly created earth after the resurrection. The use of the word "paradise" in Jewish writings makes it unlikely that Luke pictured paradise as an interim abode where the repentant thief (together with Lazarus and Abraham and other righteous dead) would await future resurrection.

It is hard to avoid the impression that the reason for the equation of the paradise in Luke 23:46 and an interim abode in Hades (where Lazarus supposedly is) is motivated by the need to harmonize Luke's thinking into a coherent whole, and it is not based on the evidence from the texts themselves. However, it seems that the conflict with Jesus' descent to Hades and ascent to heaven is "more imaginary than real"[77] and creates a problem only ". . . when one tries to relate it to the credal 'descent into Hell,' and even with 1 Pt 3:19–20;"[78] something Luke probably never tried to do.

### *Eternal Habitations*

The expression "eternal habitations" (αἱ αἰωνίοι σκηναί) occurs close to the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, in an application to the story of the Unjust Steward:[79] "Make friends for yourselves by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal habitations [NRSV: homes]" (Lk 16:9).[80] Scholars

---

[77] Marshall, *Luke*, 873.

[78] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1511.

[79] The Unjust Steward is one of the most controversial pieces in New Testament scholarship. Ireland has surveyed approximately 140 different interpretations of the story which he categorizes under five different titles with several subtitles; *Stewardship*, 5–47. Kloppenborg does not exaggerate when he states that, ". . . there is hardly a consensus on any single aspect of this parable;" "Dishonoured", 474.

[80] There is a wide disagreement among scholars whether v. 9 belonged to the original story or not and whether the original story ended at v. 7, or 8a, or 8b. Those who understand v. 9 as an original part of the story include, e.g., Fletcher, "The Riddle of the Unjust Steward: Is Irony the Key," 19–20; Williams, "Is Almsgiving the Point of the 'Unjust Steward,'" 296; Hiers, "Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat (Luke 16:9)," 32–33; Feuillet, "Mauvais riche," 213; Ireland, *Stewardship*, 94–96. The ultimate authenticity of the story is hardly ever questioned. One of the few is Drury who attributes the story to "Luke's creative abilities," *Parables*, 143.149. He compares the steward's action to the cunning activity of many Old Testament heroes. In his view, an especially close parallel is the story of the four Samaritan lepers in 2 Kgs 7. Drury concludes: "However odd the unjust steward may seem to the morally nice reader, it is very much at home in Luke's Gospel, not least in its imitation of Old Testament narrative precedents." If the parable is to be attributed to Luke, then, of course, there is no such thing as its "original" meaning outside the Lukan context. The Jesus Seminar voted vv. 1–8a red ("Jesus undoubtedly said this or something very like it") and vv. 8b–9

frequently point to the connection between the two stories in Luke's chapter 16, and the difficult story of the Unjust Steward is often understood in light of this connection as an eschatological instruction. The two stories are antithetical to each other: whereas the unjust steward secured an eschatological company for himself in the eternal habitations by his prudent use of possessions (16:9), the rich man found himself to be separated from others by the great chasm (16:26) because of his selfish use of his wealth.[81] According to this reading, the "friends" who welcome the steward to the eternal habitations are the poor who are to be helped by works of charity.[82] Against this view, it has been pointed out that charity is not very explicit in the story. The amounts owed are so large that the debtors cannot themselves be poor and thus counted among the "friends."[83] Despite this imbalance, both the immediate and the wider context seem to support this reading. Charitable works and eschatological reward are also related to one another in other passages in Luke (and other synoptic tradition).[84] Jesus answers the rich ruler who wishes to inherit eternal life: "Sell all that you own and distribute to the poor" (Lk 18:22)[85] and instructs the rich to invite the poor

black ("Jesus did not say this; it represents the perspective or content of a later or different tradition"); see Funk & Scott & Butts, *Parables*, 32.

[81] Feuillet "Mauvais riche," 222.

[82] Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden 2*, 507; Plummer, *S. Luke*, 385; Williams, "Almsgiving," 295; Hiers, "Friends," 33–36; Johnson, *Function*, 157; Feuillet, "Mauvais riche," 213–15; Seccombe, *Possessions*, 169. Others have objected and pointed out that it must be God who makes the decision of receiving or not receiving. Thus, the third person plural of the verb δέχομαι must be understood as a circumlocution for God or angels as his substitutes; see Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 43, n. 3; Grundmann, *Lukas*, 321; Ellis *Luke*, 200. Ireland combines these views; while the ultimate vote rests with God, the poor, by welcoming their benefactors, testify to their faith that was seen in their acts of charity; *Stewardship*, 103.

[83] Fletcher, "Riddle," 23. Piper solves the problem by assuming that the debtors, themselves wholesale dealers, could transfer the benefit they gained by reducing the price of oil and wheat and thus pass on the benefaction to their poor customers; "Social Background," 1649–51. Piper's interpretation is appealing but problematic. First, how would the poor customers know that it was the steward whom they are to thank and thus pay him back by receiving him in their homes? Secondly, v. 4 implies that it is the debtors who benefit and from whom the steward expects reciprocal help. Piper argues that this is uncertain because Luke is deliberately vague at this point and does not make explicit who are the subject of the verb δέχομαι. Even so, it is hardly believable, as Fletcher points out, "that the elegant steward, who shrinks from digging and from begging, would make it his hope to be received into the huts of peons" (p. 23).

[84] Williams, "Almsgiving," 293–94; Hiers, "Friends," 33–34.

[85] Parr. Mk 10:21; Mt 19:21.

and the disabled "for you will be repaid at the resurrection of the righteous" (Lk 14:13–14).[86] Not least significant in this perspective is the Rich Man and Lazarus where the neglect of the poor means condemnation to otherworldly pain.

In the context of the Unjust Steward, then, the "eternal habitations" are juxtaposed with the earthly dwellings of the debtors in v. 4 where the steward is hoping to be received after his dismissal. The whole of v. 9 is clearly formulated on the basis of v. 4 This is evident especially concerning the latter part of the verses: "so that, when I am dismissed as manager (ἵνα ὅταν μετασταθῶ), people may welcome me (δέξωνται με) into their homes (εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν)"—"so that when it is gone (ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ) they may welcome you (δέξωνται ὑμᾶς) into the eternal habitations (εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς)."[87] This implies that the expression "eternal habitations" was coined for this particular context and simply means the good lot of the righteous.

The expression "eternal habitations" has been characterized as "unusual,"[88] "remarkable,"[89] "paradoxical,"[90] and "ironic."[91] Such remarks are due to the fact that the basic meaning of σκηνή is a tent, a collapsible shelter.[92] The word occurs in the LXX some 435 times.[93] It is most frequently used of either the habitations of the migratory patriarchs and Israel wandering in the wilderness[94] or of

---

[86] Fletcher objects that such "self-interested philanthropy stands in jarring contrast to the general tone of Jesus' teaching" ("Riddle," 25) but Lk 14:13–14 and 18:18–22 contradict this objection. To imitate Drury's statement (cf. note 80 above), "however odd this teaching may seem to the morally nice reader, it is very much at home in Luke's Gospel."

[87] Hiers, "Friends," 32–33; cf. Johnson, *Literary Function*, 156–57. The close connection between v. 9 and v. 4 on one hand and v. 8 on the other, makes Hiers conclude that v. 9 must be part of the original story. Other scholars, who acknowledge that v. 9 is modeled in imitation of v. 4 solve the question of authenticity differently. According to Fitzmyer, v. 9 was formulated after v. 4 in pre-Lukan tradition; *Luke*, 1105. According to Kloppenborg, it is "quite likely" a Lukan commentary on v. 4; "Dishonoured," 475.

[88] Ireland, *Stewardship*, 103.

[89] Plummer, *S. Luke*, 386.

[90] Bruce, *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, 370.

[91] Porter, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16.1–13): Irony *Is* the Key," 149, n. 6.

[92] Michaelis, "σκηνή," 369.

[93] Of these, 65 appear only in the Greek text with no Hebrew original; Michaelis, "σκηνή," 370.

[94] Gen 12:8; 13:3; 18:1,6,9; 26:25; Gen 31:25; Exod 18:7; Num 16:26,30; Deut 11:6. In later times, people lived in tents during the feast of Tabernacles to recall the wilderness wandering; cf. Lev 23:41–43.

the tabernacle, the meeting place with God, which, in the wilderness, was naturally also a portable construction. Thus, what strikes scholars as unusual, is the combination of impermanent dwellings and eternity.

This emphasis on the impermanent character of the word σκηνή has led to two different interpretations. The first is that there is a connection between the wilderness wandering of the past and the future eschatological consummation. This connection is explained in various ways. Either there will be a "wilderness time" before the dreamed of future, as there was one before entering the promised land,[95] or, the time of consummation itself will resemble the time in the wilderness, which was characterized by an intimate relationship between God and Israel.[96] Both of these interpretations understand the "eternal habitations" as the desired goal for the righteous. In contrast to this, the second way of reading the expression underlines the paradox contained in the image and understands the "eternal tents" as ironic; with unrighteous wealth one can only secure eternal tents, which do not last:

> Make friends for yourselves; imitate the example of the steward; use the unrighteous mammon; surround yourselves with the type of insincere, self-interested friendship it can buy; how far will this carry you when the end comes and you are finally dismissed?[97]

However, it is not certain whether Luke or his audience understood the word σκηνή as a tent.[98] The most frequent use of the word in the LXX is to refer to the tabernacle. This was, of course, a tent during the wilderness wandering but the word σκηνή is also used to translate the Hebrew word מִשְׁכָּן which implies a tabernacle of a more fixed and lasting character.[99] In the New Testament, σκηνή has twenty occurrences (half of them in the letter to the Hebrews). The word is used for the dwellings Peter is ready to make for Jesus, Moses, and Elijah at the transfiguration (Mt 17:4; Mk 9:5; Lk 9:33)

---

[95] This is suggested by Jeremias, *Gleichnisse* 43, n. 6 but see the criticism by Michaelis, "σκηνή," 379, n. 59. According to him, such an idea is nowhere maintained in the Hebrew Bible and there is no clear evidence of such a belief in post-Biblical Judaism.

[96] Evans, *Saint Luke*, 603.

[97] Fletcher, "Riddle," 29.

[98] In the judgment of Michaelis, "no contemporary of Jesus would take the expression as referring to dwelling in a tent;" "σκηνή," 379–80.

[99] Michaelis, "σκηνή," 373.

but it also appears in scriptural citations or allusions (Acts 7:43; 15:6; Heb 11:9), and, most frequently, in references to the tabernacle of Israel (Acts 7:44; Heb 8:5; 9:2,3,6,8,11,21; 13:10). In the letter to the Hebrews, the tabernacle which Moses was commanded to make is described as only the "sketch and shadow" of the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 8:5). This heavenly temple, which is not made with human hands and where Christ, the heavenly high priest, offers worship, is also called a σκηνή (Heb 8:2; 9:11), even though it certainly is of an eternal, not only impermanent nature. Similarly, in Revelation, the dwelling place of God, the heavenly temple, is called a σκηνή (Rev 13:6; 15:5). At the end of times, this New Jerusalem will descend from heaven to the renewed earth and the dwelling place of God (σκηνή) will be in midst of his people (Rev 21:2–3). This probably also goes back to a Hebrew Bible image where the liberated Jerusalem is compared to "a quiet habitation, an immovable tent" (Isa 33:20; the LXX has σκηναὶ αἵ οὐ μὴ σεισθῶσιν).[100]

Thus, it is not likely the impermanent character of the word σκηνή Luke has in mind but the heavenly dwelling place of God. But when will the righteous be received in these eternal habitations? The answer depends on how one reads the temporal clause ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ. The stand taken depends on the general view one has of Luke's eschatology. Some explain that the moment when the "wealth is gone" is at the death of each individual;[101] others think it refers to the parousia when the present world (which mammon symbolizes) comes to an end.[102] Accordingly, the former scholars interpret "eternal habitations" to refer to eternal life in heaven, the latter to eschatological dwellings in the new age (upon earth).

Clearly both readings are possible. The reference is too ambiguous to allow for a definitive choice. This ambiguity points once again to the conclusion that the timing of the ἔσχατον is not that significant for Luke. The point lies in the paraenesis, the preparedness for the end, shown by right behavior. No matter when the end comes—whether at the death of an individual or when this world comes to an end—those who have used their possessions wisely will enter the eternal habitations reserved for the righteous.

---

[100] Seccombe, *Possessions*, 168.

[101] Thus Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden 2*, 507; Dupont, "Après-Mort," 12–15; Feuillet, "Mauvais riche," 214; Haufe, "Individuelle," 442; Bovon, *Lukas 3*, 81–82.

[102] Jeremias, *Gleichnisse*, 43; Mattill, *Last Things*, 37–39; Seccombe, *Possessions*, 168; Ireland, *Stewardship*, 100–101, 104.

### *Kingdom of God, Eternal Life, Heaven*

The "eternal habitations" of Luke 16:9 designate, by definition, the final destination of the righteous. There are several other ways in which Luke refers to the ultimate blessed state of the righteous. An example of how different expressions are combined is the story of the rich ruler (Lk 18:18–27).[103] The man's initial question to Jesus is: "What must I do to inherit eternal life (ζωὴ αἰώνιος, v. 18)?" Part of Jesus' answer is that, if the man sells all he has and distributes to the poor, he will have treasure in heaven (θησαυρός ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, v. 22). The man leaves and Jesus comments how hard it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of God (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 24). The disciples worry: "Then who can be saved" (σωθῆναι, v. 26)?

The last two terms (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, σώζω and its derivatives) are both used frequently and have a wide range of meaning. "Salvation" may denote a recovery from illness or other physical danger (Lk 8:36,48; 18:42; Acts 4:9; 14:9; 16:30, 27:20,31) The worldly dimension of salvation is defined in Jesus' inaugural sermon in Nazareth as release for captives, recovery of sight for the blind, and freedom for the oppressed (Lk 4:18). All this also means salvation from the power of sin and death (Lk 1:77–79; Acts 2:40,47; 11:14–18; 16:30). The word often has eschatological connotations, as in the story of the rich ruler quoted above (Lk 18:26). Another passage where the eschatological salvation is clearly intended is the teaching concerning the narrow gate (Lk 13:23–30; cf. 9:24; 19:10). When someone asks, "Lord, will only a few be saved?" Jesus answers by recounting a story of an owner of a house who shuts the doors of his house (13:25–27)[104] and describing the expulsion from the kingdom of God (13:28–30).

This is not the place to give an extensive treatment of the term "kingdom of God" in Luke. In brief, it may be noted that the term includes several features. The kingdom of God is something that has come near or is already present in Jesus' proclamation and his healing

[103] The story has synoptic parallels in Mk 10:17–27 and Mt 19:16–26. Both of them use the same terminology as Luke (albeit Matthew uses the expression "kingdom of heaven" instead of "kingdom of God).

[104] Vv. 26–27 ("Then you will begin to say, 'We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets.' But he will say, 'I do not know where you come from; go away from me, all you evildoers!'") have close affinities with the Matthean description of the last judgment; Mt 25:41–43.

action.[105] Often the kingdom designates the subject of the proclamation of Jesus (and the apostles). This feature is well-rooted in the synoptic tradition. Mark summarizes Jesus' preaching as "proclaiming the good news of God and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near'" (Mk 1:14–15). Similarly, Matthew describes Jesus as "proclaiming the good news of the kingdom" (Mt 4:23; 9:35; cf. 10:7; 24:14). Differently from the other synoptics, however, the kingdom, for Luke, is the direct object of the proclamation; Jesus proclaims the kingdom of God (κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, Lk 8:1),[106] as do Paul and other apostles in the book of Acts.[107]

Another typical way in which Luke frequently uses the expression is in a spatial sense. The kingdom of God is something where people enter (εἰσελθεῖν or εἰσπορεύεσθαι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Lk 18:24–25, cf. 23:42; Acts 14:22).[108] Again, this meaning derives from the earlier synoptic tradition. In the warning against temptation, a passage Luke has omitted,[109] the Markan Jesus contrasts the kingdom with Gehenna: "If your eye causes you to stumble, tear it out; it is better for you to enter the kingdom of God with one eye than to have two eyes and to be thrown into Gehenna [NRSV: hell]" (9:47). This contrast with Gehenna together with the fact that, in the previous verses, Mark speaks about "life" (ζωή, vv. 43 and 45)[110]

[105] Lk 9:27 (parr. Mk 9:1//Mt 16:28); 10:9,11; 11:2 (par. Mt 6:10); 11:20 (par. Mt 12:28); 17:21; 21:31.

[106] Cf. Lk 9:2; Acts 20:25; 28:31. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs also as an object of the verbs εὐαγγελίζομαι (Lk 4:43; 8:1), διαγγέλλω (9:60), and διαμαρτύρομαι (Acts 28:23); cf. the constructions ἔλαλει περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk 9:11), λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 1:3), εὐαγγελιζομένῳ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 8:12), and διαλεγόμενος περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 19:8).

[107] Acts 8:12; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23,31. Cf. Lk 9:2,60. The question of whether the kingdom for Luke is a present or a future reality has dominated much of the discussion concerning Luke's eschatology, see chap. 14.2.

[108] The kingdom is understood as a spatial entity also in Lk 13:28–29; 14:15; 22:16,18,29–30.

[109] Cf. above pp. 272–73.

[110] Matthew has "life" all along:

> If your hand or your foot causes you to stumble, cut it off and throw it away; it is better for you to enter life maimed or lame than to have two hands or two feet and to be thrown into the eternal fire. And if your eye causes you to stumble, tear it out and throw it away; it is better for you to enter life with one eye than to have two eyes and to be thrown into the Gehenna [NRSV: hell] of fire (Mt 18:8–9).

Luke has omitted the passage. Whereas Gehenna or the eternal fire of destruction is a favorite theme for Matthew (3:10,12; 5:22,29,30; 7:19; 10:28; 13:40,42,50; 18:8–9; 23:15,33; 25:41,46), Luke speaks of each only once (3:9,17; par. Mt 3:10,12

instead of the kingdom of God point to the conclusion that Mark understands the expression to refer to the (eternal?) fate after this life. Similarly, the Matthean Jesus warns that ". . . not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord', will enter (εἰσελεύσεται) the kingdom of heaven" (7:21). The future tense of the verb points to a future admittance to the kingdom. However, in all these passages, it remains unclear whether this entering is envisioned as taking place after death or already during this life, perhaps instead of death; whether "life" in the kingdom is eternal or prolonged; whether the kingdom is located on earth or in heaven. Whatever the answers to these questions, it is clear that the term "kingdom of God" means the final destiny of the faithful.

The most concrete image of the life in the kingdom is offered in the above-mentioned passage concerning salvation and the narrow gate (Lk 13:23–28). The good lot of the righteous is depicted as a feast in the kingdom of God (13:28–29). Those who are let inside the kingdom participate in a banquet with the patriarchs and the prophets: "There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrown out. Then people will come from east and west, from north and south, and will eat in the kingdom of God." Comparison with the Matthean counterpart reveals that Luke has made some additions. One of them is that those who remain outside can see the patriarchs. This resembles the Rich Man and Lazarus where the rich man in Hades can see Lazarus and Abraham. Other emphases added by Luke include the universality of those entering the kingdom: people come from all directions, not only from the east and the west as in Matthew,[111] and the mention of all the prophets (Matthew refers only to the three patriarchs).[112]

In the synoptic tradition, the reward of the faithful is also sometimes referred to as "eternal life" (ζωὴ αἰώνιος). However, this is a rather rare expression.[113] It occurs in the story of the Rich Ruler

---

and 12:5; par. Mt 10:28) even though he also has parallel passages for Mt 7:16–20 (Lk 6:43–45) and Mt 23:1–36 (Lk 11:37–54). It is not clear, however, whether Luke has omitted the references to a fiery hell or Matthew added them.

[111] The four winds, an allusion to Ps 107:2–3 undoubtedly refer to the admittance of the Gentiles to the kingdom; cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1023.

[112] Cf. Lk 11:50 (contrast Mt 23:35; Lk 24:27).

[113] Strictly speaking, the above-mentioned passage, Mk 9:43–47, par. Mt 18:8–9, also simply speaks of "life" without reference to its duration. Cf. Mt 7:14: "For the

and the following instruction concerning the rewards of the disciples (Mk 10:17–31; parr. Mt 19:16–30; Lk 18:18–30; cf. above), in the Matthean description of the last judgment (25:46),[114] and in Luke's version of the lawyer's question concerning the greatest commandment (10:25).[115] In addition to these two passages in the gospel (Lk 10:25; 18:18–30), Luke refers to "eternal life" only once in Acts, in Paul's speech in Antioch of Pisidia (13:46,48).[116] When it becomes clear that Jews do not receive his message, Paul declares: "It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you. Since you reject it and do not consider yourselves to be worthy of eternal life, we are now turning to the Gentiles" (13:46). When the Gentiles hear this, they rejoice and ". . . as many as was destined for eternal life became believers" (13:48). In Acts 11:18, the apostles rejoice in hearing that "God has given even to the Gentiles the repentance that leads to life (τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωήν)" which undoubtedly refers to eternal life.

Eternal life is not defined in more detail in these passages. It is not clear, for example, whether Luke envisions it as taking place on earth or in heaven.[117] As also elsewhere in the Bible, the word heaven

gate is narrow and the road is hard that leads to life, and there are few who find it."

114 The scene ends with the description of the different fates of the "goats" and the "sheep:" "And these will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life."

115 Luke does not call the command to love God and one's neighbor as oneself "the greatest commandment" (ἐντολὴ μεγάλη in Mt 22:36; ἐντολὴ πρώτη in Mk 12:28). Instead, his lawyer asks: "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" The words τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω are exactly the same as the rich ruler uses in Lk 18:18 and are taken practically *verbatim* from Mark (Mk 10:17).

116 Cf. above p. 257.

117 Eternal life is actually only rarely explicitly situated in heaven as in 2 Cor 5:1–10 (God has an eternal abode for us in heaven); Phil 3:20 (we are citizens of heaven), Heb 11:16 (God has prepared a heavenly city for the righteous); Rev. 11:12 (the righteous will ascend to heaven); Reddish, "Heaven," 90. Another such incidence is John 14:1–3 even though neither "eternal life" nor "heaven" occurs there. According to Tabor, the following passages also indicate eternal life as the reward for the righteous: Mk 9:42–48; Mt 10:32–33 = Lk 12:8; Mt 25:46; Acts 13:48; John 3:16; Rom 6:23; Col 3:1–4; 1 Tim 1:16; Heb 12:22–23; Jas 1:12; 1 Pet 1:4; 2 Pet 1:4; 1 John 5:11; Jude 21; Rev 20; "Ascent," 92–93. According to him, "in most cases this involves ascent to heaven and life before the throne of God." However, the reference to eternal life is not clear in all these passages (Mt 10:32–33 = Lk 12:8 Col 3:1–4; Heb 12:22–23; 2 Pet 1:4) and in none of the rest of them is eternal life situated explicitly in the heavenly world. This is also true concerning those passages that speak of "heavenly Jerusalem" (Heb 12:22–23) or "incorruptible inheritance" that is "restored in heaven" (1 Pet 1:4). It is not clear

(οὐρανός) has two meanings for Luke:[118] it designates both the physical part of the cosmos (sky) and the abode of God and his heavenly host (heaven).[119] These two aspects are sometimes intertwined since the abode of God was envisioned as being situated above the earth, beyond the sky. For example, in the story of Jesus' ascension, two angels tell the disciples who are gazing at the sky: "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking up into the sky? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven" (Acts 1:11). Similarly, before his death Stephen ". . . filled with the Holy Spirit, looked into the sky and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7:55).

In writings that describe separate fates for the righteous and the wicked, the ultimate goal for the righteous is to reside with God. This is typical of the Hellenistic cosmology according to which the real home of humans is in the divine realm.[120] Sometimes this communion takes place on the renewed earth where the divine sphere descends. Other accounts envision the ascent of the righteous and place their final destination in heaven.[121] Many Jewish apocalypses describe the heavenly world in detail. The multiple heavens contain both the physical realms (the lower heavens with storehouses for rain, hail, snow, etc.) and the spiritual ones, i.e., the dwelling place of the righteous and the throne of God (always in the highest heaven).[122] However, Luke does not use the word "heaven" as a place where people are going into (nor do the other synoptics). Even though there are several references to heaven with a spiritual meaning of the word in his double work, heaven is always the abode of God, not the

whether the righteous will themselves ascend to heaven to receive the reward or whether their reward will descend to them.

[118] Reddish, "Heaven," 90.

[119] For the former see, e.g., Lk 4:25; 10:18, 12:56; 16:17, 17:24; 21:33; Acts 2:5 and the passages that speak of "birds of the sky" (8:5; 9:58; 13:19). The latter is evident, e.g., in Lk 2:15; 3:21–22; 10:21; 11:13; 24:51; Acts 3:21; 7:24.

[120] Tabor, *Things Unutterable*, 63–69, 98. Cf. also above pp. 68–69.

[121] Tabor distinguishes four different kinds of ascents; *Things Unutterable*, 69–95. These are 1. ascent as an invasion of heaven, 2. ascent to receive revelation, 3. ascent to immortal heavenly life, and 4. ascent as a foretaste of the heavenly world. The first two involve the traditional idea that the place of the mortal is on earth, the two latter reflect the belief that human souls are ultimately immortal and belong in heaven.

[122] The most elaborate description of the different heavens is in *2 En.* 3–22; cf. *3 Bar.* 2–16; *T. Levi* 2–5; *Ascen. Isa* 7–10.

destination of the righteous. In relation to the righteous, Luke uses expressions as "reward in heaven" (μισθός ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; 6:23; par. Mt 5:12), and "treasure in heaven" (θησαυρός ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; 12:33; 18:22; par. Mk 10:21; Mt 19:21). The names of the disciples are written in a book in heaven (Lk 10:20).[123] These do not indicate that the disciples will be in heaven, only that there is "a heavenly account" for them, according to which they will be rewarded.[124]

This association of the word οὐρανός with the abode of God does not have to exclude the idea that Luke locates paradise (and perhaps also Lazarus' communion with Abraham) in a heavenly realm. This would fit together with his description of Jesus' ascent to God in heaven. However, in most of the passages that portray the reward of the righteous, the location of the blessed place is not essential and thus is not stated explicitly.

All in all, it is clear that Luke uses several different images to describe the good lot of the faithful. The righteous will inherit eternal life, probably situated in the heavenly world, even though described using earthly images (most often a messianic banquet). The description of the consolation of Lazarus is most likely another image of this eternal bliss, not just of an intermediate state. The concept "Abraham's bosom" should not be understood as a name for a separate *place*, whether in the subterranean Hades or a heavenly paradise, as so often done in scholarship. Rather, it is an image implying Lazarus' intimate relationship with the patriarch while enjoying an otherworldly feast. In other passages, Luke describes this feast as taking place in paradise, or the kingdom of God, or the eternal habitations. All these different expressions indicate the everlasting bliss reserved for "those who are considered worthy of a place in that age" (Lk 20:35).

---

[123] Cf. Dan 12:1; *Jub.* 36:10; *T. Jud.* 20:3–4; *T. Ab.* 12:7–18.

[124] Cf. Seccombe, *Possessions*, 155–56.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

# SUMMARY OF PART FOUR

Many studies on Luke emphasize the role of eschatology and its significance for the writer of the double work. However, there is no unanimity concerning Luke's eschatological perspective, whether he is motivated by the delay of the parousia or by the expectation of an imminent end, for example. It seems that eschatology is not a structural theme for Luke and its role as the primary reason for his double work has been highly exaggerated. Eschatology is, after all, a category of later theology and it is questionable whether we can use the concept at all when discussing an ancient text; certainly we should not expect to find a particular eschatological doctrine in it.

However, a consistent eschatological doctrine is often expected of Luke's work. One way to solve the apparent contradictions found in it is to discard those passages that do not fit the scheme by labeling them traditional. The problem of such a source critical solution is that it underestimates the significance of tradition to the writer. Luke's view is not comprised of only the changes he has made to his sources but also includes all that he has retained from his tradition. An alternative solution is to read different passages as if they formed a coherent whole. The problem with this enterprise is that it seems to apply modern standards to an ancient text. Luke uses several eschatological images but they do not form a coherent whole, at least if "coherence" is understood according to our standards.

The eschatology in the story of the Rich man and Lazarus with its message of an immediate retribution after death is often seen peculiar in the broader context of Luke's double work. The tension between this kind of individual eschatology and a collective eschatological view with a general judgment at the end of time has been solved either by labeling one or the other view as traditional or by reading the story as a report of an intermediate state where the souls are waiting for the final consummation. Both these views are problematic.

It is evident that both an individual and a collective understanding of eschatology is inherent in Luke's work. An individual, immediate

reward after death is envisioned in the story of Stephen's death (Acts 7:59–60) and in the story of the penitent thief on the cross (Luke 23:42–43). Thus, there is nothing strange in the eschatological scene in the Rich Man and Lazarus nor is there anything peculiar in the fact that Jesus does not have a part in the eschatological salvation here since Jesus' role as a savior and an eschatological judge is not prominent in Luke. God is the one who saves and he is the one who judges which leaves little room for the judging role of the Son of Man, an idea that is almost absent from Luke's work. Salvation, according to Luke, is possible for anyone who repents and only for those who repent. Repentance is shown by concrete action and a change in lifestyle, often associated with the proper use of wealth. The moral of the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus fits seamlessly into this picture. The rich man (and his brothers, and the audience of Jesus who resemble the brothers) should have repented, which would have meant sharing wealth with the poor man.

On the other hand, references to collective resurrection and judgment also occur in Luke's work. This idea already appears in Luke's tradition (mainly in Q) but it has obviously pleased Luke since he has retained it. Some passages that refer to a future resurrection speak of the resurrection of the just alone; according to others, both the good and the wicked will be raised. Both the idea of the (righteous) dead enjoying a blessed life with God contemporary with life on earth and of a future resurrection occur in Luke's version of Jesus' controversy with the Sadducees. According to Luke's wording, the patriarchs "are alive to God" at the present moment (as the present tense of the verb ζάω implies) and yet the dead will be raised one day. However, in addition to the future aspect of resurrection, Luke seems to understand resurrection partly as a present reality. Those "worthy of resurrection" are a group already separate from the "children of this age;" the followers of Jesus have been resurrected from the spiritual death that ensnares all others.

All these different strands appear in Luke's work and there is no way of combining them seamlessly. Different ideas, however, are not mutually exclusive but all have their place in Luke's view of salvation. According to him, God will save all who repent and become members of the Christian community. This salvation, which is a present reality, would not be interrupted by death. Those righteous ones who die before the end of this world would be transferred to a blessed existence. Those who would still be alive at the parousia

would face a general judgment where those earlier deceased would also appear.

The author of Luke-Acts does not make clear how these different eschatological expectations are related to one another. There is no need to try to harmonize them and to understand Hades, where the rich man finds himself, as an interim abode. On the contrary, the context of the story and its moral makes it likely that a final abode of the wicked is meant. The word Hades is used to denote both—an interim and a final place of the dead—in Jewish writings. Luke's description of Hades has especially close affinities with *1 Enoch 22* which depicts an interim destination. However, these similarities do not have to mean that Luke envisioned Hades as an interim abode. The story describing locations separated by an insurmountable chasm would rather imply final punishment and consolation. Similarly, Jesus undoubtedly promises the penitent thief an everlasting fellowship with him, not just a temporary one.

If this reading is correct, Luke uses the word Hades (as well as paradise) for a final abode. This runs counter to the often-maintained view that there is a sharp distinction between Hades (an interim abode) and Gehenna in the New Testament. This claim may be true for the book of Revelation—even though the name Gehenna never occurs in it—but not for Luke. The word Gehenna occurs only once in his double work and Hades only four times, and they never appear in the same context. This makes it impossible to give any definitive answers on whether Luke distinguished between the two.

Similarly, the fate of the righteous remains vague. Luke uses several expressions when speaking of the blessed life in the afterworld. One of them is the picture of Lazarus' consolation in Abraham's bosom. The expression is unlikely to refer to a particular place but it is rather an image of an intimate relationship with the patriarch. This closely resembles Jesus' fellowship with the penitent thief in paradise. The story of the Rich Man and Lazarus does not explicitly state where Lazarus and Abraham are, whether in a separate department in a subterranean Hades or in a heavenly realm. The latter alternative is perhaps to be preferred since the final destination of the righteous, often called "paradise," was usually envisioned in heaven. Alternatively, it may have been situated on earth, but never beneath the earth. The eschatological paradise was identified with the primeval paradise that, in the meantime, was imagined as being

stored by God in heaven. There it was ready to receive the righteous, either immediately after death or after the judgment when it would be replaced back on earth.

It is, however, noteworthy that the word "paradise" does not occur in the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. In different stories and different contexts Luke uses different terms to express the abode of the righteous dead. One such term is "eternal habitations" where those who have used their possessions wisely are received (Lk 16:9). The context supports the reading that this reward is connected with charitable works but the time of this eschatological consummation remains obscure. Both a collective and an individual interpretation are possible. A similar vagueness is characteristic of many other passages that deal with the future reward of the righteous. Luke is not consistent with the terminology he uses but expressions such as "the kingdom of God" and "eternal life" are practically synonymous. This reward will presumably be given in heaven with God, even though it is often described using earthly images, such as a messianic banquet. The chosen ones from all the nations will eat together with the patriarchs and the prophets in the kingdom (Lk 13:28–29), an image corresponding to Lazarus' position with Abraham.

# CONCLUSIONS

Luke's story of the Rich Man and Lazarus aims at giving a paradigmatic model of how to live one's life and at exhorting the hearers to repentance. A significant part in both of these lessons is the revelation of the fate of the dead. The otherworldly reversal of the fates of the rich man and the poor man emphasizes the seriousness of following the right way of life. Thus, the revelation of the fate of the dead serves the moral exhortation. In this regard, the story resembles, e.g., the story of Er in Plato's *Republic* and can be called an "apocalyptic story."

According to the story, the otherworldly fate is experienced immediately after death. Different people face different fates in the hereafter. These compensate for the inequality experienced on earth. The good fate means blessed existence with the patriarchs and other holy figures. The evil fate is torment, described as punishment with burning flames and unquenchable thirst. This fate is final; it is not possible to change it after death. This is illustrated by the image of a great chasm that separates the different abodes of the dead. Repentance is possible only on earth, following the exhortation of Moses and the prophets.

A story is a story and follows narrative rules. It is not possible—or relevant—to speculate on whether Luke literally believed in life after death exactly in the terms in which he couches his story. What is relevant is to notice that Luke uses culturally credible imagery. His description of the otherworldly conditions is believable according to the parameters of his cultural world. The imagery used, such as the banquet of the blessed and fiery torments, may be defined as cultural commonplaces. This becomes evident when Luke's account is compared to other ancient descriptions of life after death.

The closest affinities to Luke's afterworld are not found in Egypt or rabbinic Judaism, as could be inferred from previous scholarship on the story. The Demotic folktale and the rabbinic stories that are usually cited as relevant parallels do not illuminate the many details of Luke's account. Their most striking common denominator is the unexpected reversal that takes place after death. However, they are not the only known stories using this narrative motif in antiquity but

there are many others as well. Thus, the traditional parallel stories testify that Luke bases his account on a popular and well-known theme, the reversal of fates after death. However, in other respects, these parallels are of little value in shedding light on the otherworldly conditions in Luke's story. On the whole, it is doubtful whether there are any particular stories circulating around that the teller of the story must have known. The story is simply based on the common cultural intertexture that prevailed around the Mediterranean and the Near East. One element in this intertexture was the narrative motif of reversal, also used in the Demotic tale and rabbinic stories, but probably known to Luke from quite different stories.

Comparison with other Hellenistic stories shows that the different elements in Luke's account are indeed well-rooted in this cultural matrix, its worldview and its beliefs concerning life after death. Similar elements occur in several descriptions in both Greek and Jewish writings. These different accounts contain numerous counterparts for both the basic structures and the details of Luke's story.

The differentiation of the otherworldly fate was a common belief in the Hellenistic world, as attested by both pagan and Jewish sources. Even though there were many, partly contradictory, views concerning life after death and different writers emphasize different aspects, it is clear that the division between the blessed and the cursed in the otherworld was a commonplace. It is not easy to definitely state how widespread such a belief was in antiquity but the diversity of the available sources seems to indicate that it was more common than often assumed in scholarship. This does not exclude the fact that the traditional view of an undifferentiated fate after death also had its adherents. There were also people who denied all forms of postmortem existence, albeit they undoubtedly were in a minority. Be that as it may, the sources attest that both a blessed life and punishment after death were imagined as possible. Many philosophers speculate about the matter and scorn the ideas they believe represent the view of the uneducated. Luke belonged to the educated, literate elite of his time and was, in all likelihood, well acquainted with different literary descriptions of life after death.

In most descriptions, the division between the dead is made on moral grounds; the pious receive the good lot, the wicked are punished. Sometimes the division is based on ritual grounds, such as initiation. In Luke's story, the reason for the different fates is not defined as based on righteousness and unrighteousness, but on poverty

and wealth. However, as the story continues, it becomes clear that the reason for the rich man's torment is in his unrepentant lifestyle. His lack of repentance is shown in his lack of hospitality to his poor neighbor. Thus, he is a morally doubtful character who did not change his lifestyle and share his wealth while he still had time. This makes him a paradigm of an unrighteous person who is condemned and punished.

Other basic structures of the account also have counterparts in other stories of the Hellenistic world. These include the reversal of the earthly fates and the possibility of receiving a message from the world of the dead. The reversal motif is especially prominent in the last chapters of *1 Enoch*, the so-called Epistle of Enoch, and in many works of Lucian of Samosata. These describe a reversal of fates of the rich and the poor after death. However, Lucian does not describe particular rewards for the poor and the greatest punishment of all for the rich is the memory of the earthly luxury they have lost; death for him is the great equalizer. The writer of the Epistle of Enoch, on the other hand, divides the two groups of people with different fates first and foremost according to their righteousness and sinfulness. He does depict the righteous as poor and oppressed and the sinners as rich and powerful but his understanding of "sinners" differs from that of Luke.

A prominent feature in Luke's account is also the immediacy of the otherworldly retribution and consolation. This is the dominant view in most pagan Greco-Roman accounts of the fate of the dead. In many Jewish descriptions, the otherworldly fate is also experienced immediately after death, even though some of them also envision a general judgment at the end of time. Prime examples of such writings are the Book of Watchers in *1 Enoch, 4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. They describe different otherworldly departments for the righteous and the sinners where they wait until "the great day of judgment." Part of the reward or punishment is also that the righteous see the torments of the sinners and vice versa.

As the otherworldly fate is experienced immediately after death, it is also possible to let the living know the circumstances in the otherworld that are usually consequent on earthly life. The fate of the dead is revealed either through an otherworldly journey, taken by a living person, or the other way around, through a messenger from the world of the dead. The latter device is indeed one of the most frequent and universal narrative motifs in both the ancient and

modern world. This motif is also used in Luke's account even though Abraham refuses the rich man's request to have Lazarus sent to his brothers. The request is refused since it is needless—the brothers have Moses and the prophets to guide them—not because it would be impossible as such. Moreover, the audience of Jesus (as well as the readers and listeners to the gospel) naturally are appraised of the severe otherworldly consequences of an undesirable lifestyle, which is the main point of Luke's description.

There are also many similarities in details between Luke's story and other Hellenistic—both Jewish and pagan—accounts. The description of the otherworldly punishment as fire and thirst is extremely common, as is also the image of the righteous having access to refreshing water. The otherworldly bliss is often defined as happiness and rest; the image of an otherworldly banquet is frequent, especially in pagan accounts. Many other details in Luke's story are familiar from other writings. In many of them, there is someone who mediates the will of god(s), who acts as a judge or a guide in the otherworld (cf. the role of Abraham in Luke); the souls of the dead are accompanied by an escort, usually Hermes in pagan accounts but sometimes also an angel/angels (cf. angels who carry Lazarus to the bosom of Abraham); the dead are practically always described using bodily terms; a chasm or other separating boundary is found in most other descriptions of Hades as well.

The reading of different sources shows clearly that the ideas on the afterlife took a similar form in the Hellenistic intertextual milieu. It is evident that different influences from Mesopotamia, Egypt, Persia, and Greece slipped into Judaism and evolving Christianity. Different ideas, motifs, metaphors, and images were freely borrowed; they were adopted, reused, and adjusted to earlier thinking. In new contexts, however, older ideas might have been used with different functions and for different purposes. That is why it is not possible to equate the use of a certain image in one story to that in another.

This is also evident in Luke's story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Even though its afterlife imagery closely resembles many Jewish depictions, most notably that in *1 Enoch 22*, it cannot be taken for granted that Luke also understood the immediate fate after death as an intermediate fate before a general resurrection at the end of time. On the contrary, Luke's story seems to imply a final bliss for Lazarus and a final punishment for the rich man. However, in other passages the Lukan Jesus speaks of a final, collective eschatological con-

summation at the end of times. This apparent contradiction in Luke's eschatological thinking cannot be solved either with simple source critical arguments or by harmonizing the different views into one scheme (first an intermediate state with preliminary rewards and punishments, then final bliss or torment).

Luke uses many different kinds of images when describing the fate of the dead. These do not form one, harmonious whole. Different expressions, such as Hades and Gehenna, paradise and eternal habitations, are used. All this points to the conclusion that Luke did not have a clear picture in mind concerning the fate of the individual after death. Moreover, the several different eschatological emphases in his double work indicate that—in contrast to a common scholarly view—Luke did not work out a systematic eschatological doctrine. Moreover, eschatological expectations do not form a central theme in Luke-Acts and do not explain the purpose for writing the work. On the contrary, eschatological teaching is used to serve more practical aims. In the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, this aim is to exhort people to repentance, which ought to be shown by proper behavior, especially by the right use of possessions. This exhortation is aimed first and foremost at Luke's own audience. For Jesus' audience, the Pharisees, it is too late. They stay unrepentant and reject Jesus and thus show that they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, that is, obey the law, as they ought to. In this respect, the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus and its eschatological teaching also serve Luke's anti-Pharisaic polemic. Luke's audience still has a choice; true repentance, according to the teaching, will lead into blessed life.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. Texts, Translations, and Reference Works


Aeschylus. *Aeschylus in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Herbert Weir Smyth. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963 [1922–1926].

Aland, Kurt (ed.). *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. Fifteenth Revised Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

Apollodorus. *Apollodorus in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Sir James George Frazer. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961–1963 [1921].

Aristophanes. *Aristophanes in Three Volumes*. LCL. Ed. and Trans. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 1998–2000.

——. *Frogs*. Ed. with Introduction and Commentary by Kenneth Dover. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Bachmann, H. & W.A. Slaby (eds.). *Computer Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece*. Second Edition. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.

Bauer, Walter (& Kurt Aland & Barbara Aland). *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Sixth Revised Edition. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.

BinGorion, Micha Josef. *Der Born Judas 2: Legenden, Märchen und Erzählungen*. Revised Edition. Ed. Emanuel bin Gorion. Wiesbaden: Insel, 1973 [1916].

Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Black, Matthew (ed.). *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece: Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca*. PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Blass, Friedrich & Albert Debrunner (& Friedrich Rehkopf). *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Fifteenth Revised Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

Bogaert, Pierre (ed.). *Apocalypse de Baruch 1–2: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire*. SC 144–145. Paris: Cerf, 1969.

Brock, S.P. (ed.). *Testamentum Iobi*. PVTG 2. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Burchard, Christoph. "Ein vorläufiger griechischer Text von Joseph und Aseneth." Pp. 161–209 in C. Burchard, *Gesammelte Studien zu* Joseph & Aseneth. SVTP 13. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Charles, R.H. *The Book of Enoch*. Sixteenth Edition. London: SPCK 1977 [1917].

Charlesworth, James H. (ed.). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments. Vol. 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985.

Cicero. *Cicero in Twenty-Eight Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Walter C.A. Ker, Clinton Walker Keyes, J.E. King, William Armistead Falconer et al. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960–1971 [1923–1928].

——. *On Friendship & The Dream of Scipio*. Ed. with an Introduction, Translation & Commentary by J.G.F. Powell. Warminister: Aris & Phillips, 1990.

Dio Chrysostom. *Dio Chrysostom in Five Volumes*. LCL. Trans. J.W. Cohoon & H. Lamar Crosby. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961–1964 [1932–1951].

Diodorus Siculus. *Diodorus of Sicily in Twelve Volumes*. LCL. Trans. C.H. Oldfather et al. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1960–1967 [1936–1967].

Diogenes Laertius. *Diogenes Laertius in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. R.D. Hicks. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950 [1925].

Elliger, K. & W. Rudolph (eds.). *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Editio funditus renovata. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.

Epictetus. *Epictetus in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. W.A. Oldfather. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959–1961 [1925–1928].

Epstein, Isidore (gen. ed.). *The Babylonian Talmud*. Reprinted in 18 Vols. London: Soncino Press, 1961.

Euripides. *Euripides in Four Volumes*. LCL. Ed. and Trans. David Kovacs. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994–1999.

——. *Euripidis perditarum tragoediarum fragmenta*. Ed. by August Nauck. Leipzig: Teubner, 1869.

Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Kirsopp Lake & J.E.L. Oulton. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964–1965 [1926–1932].

García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Geffcken, J. (ed.). *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. GCS 8. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902.

Goldschmidt, Lazarus (ed.). *Der Babylonische Talmud: Mit Einschluss der vollständigen Mishnah*. 9 Vols. Haag: Nijoff, 1933–1935.

Gow, A.S.F. & D.L. Page. *The Greek Anthology Hellenistic Epigrams 2: Commentary and Indexes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Greek Anthology. *The Greek Anthology in Five Volumes*. LCL. Trans. W.R. Paton. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953–1960 [1916–1918].

Griffith, Francis Llewellyn. *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis: The Sethon of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1900.

Harrington, Daniel J. & Charles Perrot & Pierre-Maurice Bogaert (eds.). *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*. 2 Vols. Trans. Jacques Cazeaux (vol. 1.) SC 229–230. Paris: Cerf, 1976.

Hatch, Edwin & Henry Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.

Hengel, Martin, Jacob Neusner, Peter Schäfer et al. (eds.). *Talmud Yerushalmi*. 19 Vols. Trans. Gerd A. Wewers et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1975–2000.

Herodotus. *Herodotus in Four Volumes*. LCL. Trans. A.D. Godley. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960–1961 [1920–1925].

Hesiod. *Theogony*. Ed. with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. West. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

——. *Theogony & Works and Days*. Trans. with Introduction and Notes by M.L. West. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hippolytus. *Refutatio omnium haeresium*. PTS 25. Ed. Miroslav Marcovich. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

Homer. *Opera*. 5 Vols. OCT. Ed. Thomas W. Allen. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946–1952 [1902–1912].

——. *The Iliad*. Trans. E.V. Rieu. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1950.

——. *The Odyssey*. Trans. and Analysis by R.D. Dawe. Sussex: The Book Guild, 1993.

Houghton, Herbert Pierrepont. "The Coptic Apocalypse." *Aegyptus* 39 (1959), 40–91.

James, Montague Rhodes. "A Fragment of the 'Penitence of Jannes and Jambres.'" *JTS* 2 (1901), 572–77.

——. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. Translations of Early Documents, Series 1. New York: Macmillan, 1917.

de Jonge, Marinus (ed.). *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum: According to Cambridge University Library MS Ff 1.24 fol. 203a–261b*. PVTG 1. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Josephus. *Josephus in Nine Volumes*. LCL. Trans. H.StJ. Thackeray, R. Marcus and L. Feldman. London: William Heineman & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Knibb, Michael A. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments 2. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Lévi, Israel. "Un recueil des contes Juifs inédits." *REJ* 35 (1897), 65–83.

Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Reading. Vol. 3: The Late Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Liddell, Henry G. & Robert Scott (& Sir Henry S. Jones). *A Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996 [1843].

Long, Anthony A. & David N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. Vol. 1: Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary. Vol. 2: Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Lucian. *Lucian in Eight Volumes*. LCL. Trans. A.M. Harmon, K. Kilburn & M-D. MacLeod. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960–1967 [1915–1967].

——. *Opera*. 4 Vols. OCT. Ed. M.C. MacLeod. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972–1987.

Lucretius. *De rerum natura*. OCT. Ed. Cyril Bailey. Oxford: Clarendon, 1947.

Maraval, Pierre. "Fragments grecs du livre de Jannès et Jambré (Pap. Vindob. 29456 et 29828 Verso)." *ZPE* 25 (1977), 199–207.

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*. LCL. Trans. C.R. Haines. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961 [1916].

Maspero, Gastion. "Contes relatifs aux grands prètres de Memphis." *Journal des savants* 1901, 473–504.

——. *Les contes populaires de l'Égypte Ancienne*. Third Revised and Enlarged Edition. Paris: Guilmoto, s.a.

Milik, Józef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Nestle, Erwin & Kurt Aland (eds.). *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Twenty-Seventh Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Neusner, Jacob (ed.). *The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Explanation*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. 42 Vols. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1982–1993.

Origenes. *Der Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus 3*. Ed. Hermann J. Vogt. BGL 38. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1993.

Parmenides of Elea. *Fragments*. A Text and Translation with an Introduction by David Gallop. Phoenix Sup 18. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000 [1984].

Pausanias. *Pausanian in Four Volumes*. LCL. Trans. W.H.S. Jones. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964–1965 [1918–1935].

Philo. *Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*. LCL. Trans. F.H. Colson & G.H. Whitaker. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1953.

Philostratus. *Flavius Philostratus: Heroikos with Glossary, Notes, and Introduction*. Trans. Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean and Ellen Bradshaw Aitken. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 1. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Picard, J.-C. (ed.). *Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*. PVTG 2. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
Pindar. *Pindar in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. William H. Race. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 1997.
Plato. *Plato in Twelve Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Harold North Fowler, W.R.M. Lamb et al. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961–1999 [1914–1935].
——. *Republic 10*. Trans. with Commentary by S. Halliwell. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988.
——. *The Dialogues of Plato 1: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Meno, Gorgias, Menexenus*. Trans. with Analysis by R.E. Allen. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.
Pliny. *Natural History in Ten Volumes*. LCL. Trans. H. Rackham. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958–1960 [1938–1945].
Plutarch. *Plutarch's Moralia in Sixteen Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, Phillip H. de Lacy & Benedict Einarsson, Harold Cherniss et al. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960–1976 [1927–1976].
Propertius. *Propertius*. LCL. Trans. H.E. Butler. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962 [1912].
——. *The Poems*. Trans. with Notes W.G. Shepherd. London: Penguin Books, 1985.
Pseudo-Plato. *Axiochus*. Ed. Jackson P. Hershbell. SBLTT 21. Graeco-Roman Religion Series 6. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
Quintilian. *Quintilian in Four Volumes*. LCL. Trans. H.E. Butler. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961 [1922].
Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979 [1935].
Robinson, James M. & Paul Hoffman & John S. Kloppenborg. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
Rosenstiehl, Jean-Marc. *L'apocalypse d'Élie: Introduction, traduction et notes*. Textes et études pour servir à l'histoire du judaïsme intertestamentaire 1. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1972.
Russell, D.A. & N.G. Wilson (eds.). *Menander Rhetor: With Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
Schneemelcher, Wilhelm (ed.). *New Testament Apocrypha*. Vol. 1: Gospels and Related Writings. Vol. 2: Writings Related to the Apostles, Apocalypses, and Related Subjects. Trans. R. McL. Wilson. Revised Editions. Cambridge: James Clarke & Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991–1992.
Seneca. *Moral Essays in Three Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Richard M.Gummere. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961–1965.
Sextus Empiricus. *Sextus Empiricus in Four Volumes*. LCL. Trans. R.G. Bury. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961 [1933–1949].
Sophocles. *Sophocles in Three Volumes*. LCL. Ed. and Trans. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 1994–1996.
Steindorff, Georg (ed.). *Apokalypse des Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse. Koptische Texte, Übersetzung, Glossar*. TUGAL, Neue Folge 2. Band, Heft 3a. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899.
Stone, Michael Edward (ed.). *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Recensions*. SBLTT 2, Pseudepigrapha Series 2. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
Strabo. *Strabo in Eight Volumes*. LCL. Trans. Horace Leonard Jones. London: William Heinemann & Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959–1961 [1917–1932].
Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem*. 2 Vols. OECT. Trans. and Ed. Ernest Evans. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
Tischendorf, Constantin von (ed.). *Apocalypses Apocryphae Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Iohannis item Mariae dormitio*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966 [1866].

Violet, Bruno (ed.). *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV Esra) 1: Die Überlieferung*. GCS 18. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs 1910.
Virgil. *Virgil in Two Volumes*. LCL. Trans. H. Rushton Fairchild. Rev. G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 1999 [1916].
Wehrli, Fritz (ed.). *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Texte und Kommentar 7: Heraklides Pontikos. Second Edition. Basel & Stuttgart: Schwabe, 1969.

## B. Secondary Literature

Aalen, Sverre. "St. Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of *1 Enoch*." *NTS* 13 (1966–67), 1–13.
Abel, Ernest L. "The Psychology of Memory and Rumor Transmission and Their Bearing on Theories of Oral Transmission in Early Christianity." *JR* 51 (1971), 270–81.
Achtemeier, Paul J. "*Omne Verbum Sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity." *JBL* 109 (1990), 3–27.
Aejmelaeus, Lars. *Schwachheit als Waffe: Die Argumentation des Paulus im "Tränenbrief" (2. Kor. 10–13)*. SFTL 78. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht & Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2000.
Alderink, Larry J. *Creation and Salvation in Ancient Orphism*. American Classical Studies 8. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
——. "Mythical and Cosmological Structure in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*." *Numen* 29 (1982), 1–16.
Alexander, Philip S. "Orality in Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism at the Turn of the Eras." Pp. 159–84 in Henry Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition*. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Andersen, Øivind. "Oral Tradition." Pp. 17–58 in Henry Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Annas, Julia. "Plato's Myths of Judgement." *Phronesis* 27 (1982), 119–43.
Attridge, Harold W. "Greek and Latin Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979), 159–86.
——. "Josephus and His Works." Pp. 185–232 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
Aune, David E. "Prolegomena to the Study of Oral Tradition in the Hellenistic World." Pp. 59–106 in Henry Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
——. "Transformations of Apocalypticism in Early Christianity." Pp. 54–64 in Lester L. Grabbe & Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationship*. JSPSup. 46. London & New York: T & T Clark, 2003.
Avagianou, Aphrodite A. "Physiology and Mysticism at Pherai: The Funerary Epigram for Lykophoron." *Kernos* 15 (2002), 75–89.
Avery-Peck, Alan J. & Jacob Neusner (eds.). *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Babut, Daniel. "Le dialogue de Plutarque 'Sur le démon de Socrate.' Essai d'interprétation." *BAGB* 1 (1984), 51–76.
Bailey, Kenneth. "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels. *AJT* 5 (1991), 34–54.
Baines, John. "Literacy (ANE)." *ABD 4*, 333–37. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Bammel, Ernst. "πτωχός κτλ." *TWNT 6*, 885–915. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959.
Barr, James. "The Question of Religious Influence: The Case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christianity." *JAAR* 53 (1985), 201–35.

Barrett, C. Kingsley. "Stephen and the Son of Man." Pp. 32–38 in *Apophoreta*. FS Ernst Haenchen. BZNW 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.

Bauckham, Richard J. "The Apocalypse of Peter: An Account of Research." *ANRW 2.25.6*, 4712–50. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.

——. "Hades. Hell." *ABD 3*, 14–15. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

——. "Early Jewish Visions of Hell." Pp. 49–80 in R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998. [Reprint of "Early Jewish Visions of Hell." *JTS* 41 (1990), 355–85.]

——. "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and the Parallels." Pp. 97–118 in R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998. [Reprint of "The Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and the Parallels." *NTS* 37 (1991), 225–46.]

——. "Descents to the Underworld." Pp. 9–48 in R. Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998. [Reprint of "Descents to the Underworld." *ABD 2*, 145–59. New York: Doubleday, 1992.]

Beekes, Robert S.P. "*Hades* and *Elysion*." Pp. 17–28 in Ed. Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert & Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 1998.

Berger, Klaus. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Teil I: Markus und Parallelen*. WMANT 40. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

——. *Im Anfang war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums*. Stuttgart: Quell, 1997.

Berger, Klaus & Carsten Colpe. *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Texte zum Neuen Testament NTD, Textreihe 1. Göttingen & Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Bergren, Theodore A. *Sixth Ezra: The Text and Origin*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Bériou, Nicole. "Les lépreux sous le regard des prédicateurs d'après les collections de sermons ad status du XIII$^{ème}$ siècle." Pp. 35–80 in N. Bériou & F.-O. Touati *Voluntate Dei leprosus. Les lépreux entre conversion et exclusion aux XII$^{ème}$ et XIII$^{ème}$ siècles*. Testi, Studi, Strumenti 4. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioeve, 1991.

Bernstein, Alan E. *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament: Religiongeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen*. Ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti. TUGAL 76. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961.

——. "'Der Erde Kind bin ich und des gestirnten Himmels.' Zur Lehre vom Menschen in den orphischen Goldplättchen." Pp. 399–419 in Fritz Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert*. Stuttgart & Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1998.

Betz, Hans Dieter & Peter A. Dirkse & Edgar W. Smith, Jr. "De sera numinis vindicta (Moralia 548A–568A)." Pp. 181–235 in Hans Dieter Betz (ed.), *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature*. SCHNT 4. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Black, Matthew. "The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus." Pp. 172–75 in W.D. Davies & David Daube (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: In Honor of Charles Harold Dodd*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs about the Dead*. JSOTSup 123. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Boomershine, Thomas E. "Jesus of Nazareth and the Watershed of Ancient Orality and Literacy." *Semeia* 65 (1994), 7–36.

Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." Pp. 233–82 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Bornhäuser, Karl. "Zum Verständnis der Geschichte vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus Luk. 16,19–31." *NKZ* 39 (1928), 833–43.

Bottéro, Jean. "La mythologie de la mort en Mésopotamie ancienne." Pp. 25–52 in Bendt Alster (ed.), *Death in Mesopotamia: Papers Read at the XXVI[e] Rencontre assyriologique internationale*. Mesopotamia: Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology 8. Copenhagen: Akademisk forlag, 1980.

Boulanger, André. *Orphée: Rapports de l'orphisme et du christianisme*. Christianisme 10. Paris: Rieder, 1925.

Bourguignon, Erika. "Necromancy." Pp. 74–77 in Lawrence E. Sullivan (ed.), *Death, Afterlife, and the Soul*. Religion, History, and Culture: Selections from *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: MacMillan, 1989.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. Revised Edition by Hugo Gressmann. HNT 21. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1926.

Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. EKK III/1 (Lk 1,1–9,50). EKK III/2 (Lk 9,51–14,35). EKK III/3 (Lk 15,1–19,27). Zürich: Benziger Verlag & Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag, 1989, 1996, 2001.

Boys-Stones, George. "Thyrsus-Bearer of the Academy or Enthusiast for Plato?" Pp. 41–58 in Judith Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and His Intellectual World: Essays on Plutarch*. London: Duckworth, 1997.

Bremer, Jan Maarten. "Death and Immortality in Some Greek Poems." Pp. 109–24 in Jan Maarten Bremer, Theo P.J. van den Hout & Rudolph Peters (eds.), *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994.

Bremmer, Jan N. *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.

——. "Greek and Hellenistic Concepts of the Soul." Pp. 198–204 in Lawrence E. Sullivan (ed.), *Death, Afterlife, and the Soul*. Religion, History, and Culture: Selections from *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: MacMillan, 1989.

——. *Greek Religion*. *GR* New Surveys in the Classics 24. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

——. "The Soul, Death, and the Afterlife in Early and Classical Greece." Pp. 91–106 in Jan Maarten Bremer, Theo P.J. van den Hout & Rudolph Peters (eds.), *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994.

——. "Paradise: From Persia, via Greece into the *Septuagint*." Pp. 1–20 in Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

——. *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife: The 1995 Read-Tuckwell Lectures* at the *University of Bristol*. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.

Brenk, Frederick E., S.J. *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's* Moralia *and* Lives. Mnemosyne Sup 48. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

——. "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period." *ANRW 2.16.3*, 2068–2145. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

Bretherton, Donald J. "Lazarus of Bethany: Resurrection or Resuscitation?" *ExpTim* 104 (1992–93), 169–173.

Brichto, Herbert C. "Kin, Cult, Land and Afterlife—A Biblical Complex." *HUCA* 44 (1973), 1–54.

Brisson, Luc. "Les théogonies Orphiques et le papyrus de Derveni: notes critiques." *RHR* 202 (1985), 389–402. [Reprinted in Bresson, *Orphée et l'Orphisme*.]

——. *Orphée et l'Orphisme dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*. Collected Studies Series CS 476. Aldershot & Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1995.
Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. AB 29. (2 Vols.) New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970.
Bruce, A.B. *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1882.
Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Second Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
——. "εὐφραίνω κτλ." *TWNT 2*, 770–73. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
Burchard, Christoph. "The Importance of Joseph and Aseneth for the Study of the New Testament: A General Survey and a Fresh Look at the Lord's Supper." Pp. 263–95 in C. Burchard, *Gesammelte Studien zu* Joseph & Aseneth. SVTP 13. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Burkert, Walter. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Trans. Edwin L. Minar, Jr. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
——. "Craft Versus Sect: The Problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans." Pp. 1–22 in Ben F. Meyer & E.P. Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 3: Self-Definiton in the Graeco-Roman World*. London: SCM Press, 1982.
——. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classic*. Trans. John Raffan. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
——. *Ancient Mystery Cults*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 1987.
——. "Bacchic Teletai in the Hellenistic Age." Pp. 259–75 in Thomas H. Carpenter & Christopher A. Faraone (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus*. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca, NY & London: Cornell University Press, 1993.
Busse, Ulrich. "Johannes und Lukas: die Lazarusperikope, Frucht eines Kommunikationsprozesses." Pp. 281–306 in A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*. BETL 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
Bynum, Caroline W. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200 C.E.–1336 C.E.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. Second Edition. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 1999 [1927].
——. "A Proper Name for Dives." *JBL* 81 (1962), 399–402.
Carroll, John T. *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS 92. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1988.
——. "Luke's Portrayal of the Pharisees." *CBQ* 50 (1988), 604–21.
Cassuto, Umberto. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis 1: From Adam to Noah*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, 1961.
Catchpole, David. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.
Cavallin, Hans Clemens Caesarius. *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15*. Part 1: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background. ConBNT 7:1. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974.
Cave, C.H. "Lazarus and the Lucan Deuteronomy." *NTS* 15 (1968), 319–25.
Charlesworth, James. "Paradise." *ABD 5*, 154–55. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Clifford, Richard J., S.J. "The Roots of Apocalypticism in Near Eastern Myth." Pp. 3–38 in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Vol. 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity. New York & London: Continuum, 2000.
Clinton, Kevin. *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen. Acta instituti Atheniensis regni Sueciae, series in 8,11. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1992.
Cole, Susan Guettel. "New Evidence for the Mysteries of Dionysos." *GRBS* 21 (1980), 223–38.
Colish, Marcia L. *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages 1: Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature*. Second Edition. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Collins, John J. "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death." *CBQ* 36 (1974), 21–43.
——. "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14 (1979), 1–20.
——. "The Jewish Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979), 21–59.
——. "Persian Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979), 207–17.
——. "Testaments." Pp. 325–55 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
——. *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
——. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London & New York: Routledge, 1997.
——. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, MI & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
——. "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature." Pp. 119–39 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
——. "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe." Pp. 44–52 in Lester L. Grabbe & Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationship*. JSPSup. 46. London & New York: T & T Clark, 2003.
Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. BHT 17. Fifth Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1964 [1953].
——. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." Pp. 298–316 in Leander E. Keck & J. Luis Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon, 1966.
Couliano, Ioan P. *Expériences de l'exstase: Exstace, ascension et récit visionnaire de l'Hellénisme au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Payot, 1984.
——. *Out of This World: Otherworldly Journeys from Gilgamesh to Albert Einstein*. Boston & London: Shambhala, 1991.
Crehan, Joseph. "Near Eastern Societies." Pp. 97–122 in Arnold Toynbee, Arthur Koestler et al., *Life After Death*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1976.
Crossan, John Dominic. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. Second Edition. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1992.
——. *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.
——. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993.
Culianu, Ioan Petru. *Psychanodia I: A Survey of the Evidence Concerning the Ascension of the Soul and Its Relevance*. Études preliminaries aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain 99. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
Cumont, Franz. *After Life in Roman Paganism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1922.
——. *Lux Perpetua*. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1949.
Dahl, Nils A. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." Pp. 111–30 in Leander E. Keck & J. Luis Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon, 1966.
Dahood, Mitchell J. *Psalms*. AB 16, 17, 17a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965, 1968, 1970.
Davenport, G.L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. StPB 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
Davies, Jon. *Death, Burial and Rebirth in the Religions of Antiquity*. Religion in the First Christian Centuries. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.
Davies, Philip R. "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls." Pp. 189–211 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late*

*Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Day, John. "The Development of Belief in Life after Death in Ancient Israel." Pp. 231–57 in John Barton & David J. Reimer (eds.), *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Manson*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996.
Delobel, Joel. "The Fate of the Dead According to 1 Thes 4 and 1 Cor 15." Pp. 340–47 in Raymond F. Collins (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. BETL 87. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
Derrett, John Duncan Martin. "Fresh Light on St Luke 16. II: Dives and Lazarus and the Preceding Sayings." *NTS* 7 (1960–61), 364–80.
Deutsch, Nathaniel. *Guardians of the Gate: Angelic Vice Regency in Late Antiquity*. Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 22. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Dewey, Joanna. "Textuality in an Oral Culture: A Survey of the Pauline Traditions." *Semeia* 65 (1994), 37–65.
Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Revised Edition. London: Duckworth, 1996.
——. "'Orthodoxy' and 'Eclecticism': Middle Paltonists and Neo-Pythagoreans." Pp. 103–25 in John M. Dillon & Anthony A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
Dodd, Charles Harold. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. Second Edition. London: Nesbet, 1961.
Donaldson, T.L. "Parallels: Use, Misuse, and Limitations." *EvQ* 55 (1983), 193–210.
Donini, Pierluigi. "The History of the Concept of Eclecticism." Pp. 15–33 in John M. Dillon & Anthony A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
——. "Science and Metaphysics: Platonism, Aristotelianism, and Stoicism in Plutarch's *On the Face in the Moon*." Pp. 126–44 in John M. Dillon & Anthony A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
Dover, Kenneth. "Commentary." In Aristophanes, *Frogs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
Downing, F. Gerald. "Common Strands in Pagan, Jewish and Christian Eschatologies in the First Century." *TZ* 51 (1995), 196–211.
Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1977.
——. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. Cambridge: SCM Press, 1985.
Dunkerley, R. "Lazarus." *NTS* 5 (1958–59), 321–27.
Dunn, James D.G. "Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition." *SBLSP* 39 (2000), 287–326.
Dupont, Jacques. *Les Béatitudes 3: Les évangélistes*. Second Edition. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969.
——. "L'après-mort dans l'oeuvre de Luc." *RTL* 3 (1972), 3–21.
——. "Die individuelle Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte." Pp. 27–47 in P. Hoffmann (ed.), *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*. FS Josef Schmid. Freiburg, 1973.
Edmonds, Radcliffe G. III. *Myths of the Underworld Journey: Plato, Aristophanes, and the 'Orphic' Gold Tablets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
——. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. Second Edition. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Ellis, E. Earle. "Jesus, the Sadducees, and Qumran." *NTS* 10 (1963–64), 274–79.
——. "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke." *NTS* 12 (1965), 27–41.
——. "La fonction de l'eschatologie dans l'évangile de Luc." Pp. 51–65 (+ "Note additionelle" pp. 296–303) in F. Neirynck (ed.), *L'Évangile de Luc—The Gospel of Luke. Revised and Enlarged Edition of L'Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires* et *théologiques*. BETL 32. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
——. "Die Funktion der Eschatologie im Lukasevangelium." *ZTK* 66 (1969), 387–402.
——. *The Gospel of Luke*. NCB. Revised Edition. London: Oliphants, 1977 [1966].
Enslin, Morton S. "Luke and Matthew: Compilers or Authors?" *ANRW 2.25.3*, 2357–88. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.
Ernst, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. RNT. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1977.
Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. MSSNTS 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Evans, Christopher F. *Saint Luke*. TPINTC. London & Philadelphia: SCM Press, 1990.
Fallon, Francis T. "The Gnostic Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979), 123–58.
Feuillet, A. "La parabole de mauvais riche et du pauvre Lazare (Lc 16,19–31) antithèse de la parabole de l'intendant astucieux (Lc 16,1–9)." *NRTh* 111 (1979), 212–23.
Finnegan, Ruth. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*. Oxford & New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
Fischer, Ulrich. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*. ZNW 44. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. AB 28. (2 Vols.) Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 1985.
Fletcher, Donald R. "The Riddle of the Unjust Steward: Is Irony the Key?" *JBL* 82 (1963), 15–30.
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. WUNT 2. Reihe, 94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
Foley, Helene P. *The Homeric* Hymn to Demeter*: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretative Essays*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.
Francis, Fred O. "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts." *JAAR* 37 (1969), 49–63.
Frankfurter, David. *Elijah in Upper Egypt: The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity*. Studies in Antiquity & Christianity. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
Franklin, Eric. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1975.
Friedman, Richard Elliott & Shawna Dolansky Overton. "Death and Afterlife: The Biblical Silence." Pp. 35–59 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Funk, Robert W. & Bernard Brandon Scott & James R. Butts. *The Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988.
Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1995.
Ganschinietz, Ryszard. "Katabasis." *PW 10*, 2359–449. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1919.
Garland, Robert. *The Greek Way of Death*. London: Duckworth, 1985.
Geldenhuys, Norval. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Sixth Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1966 [1951].
Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Second Edition. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup & Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1964.
——. "The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels." *NTS* 34 (1988), 339–63.
——. "Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels."

Pp. 266–309 in Henry Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Gersh, Stephen. *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: The Latin Tradition 1*. Publications in Medieval Studies 23. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.
Gilbert, M. "Wisdom Literature." Pp. 283–324 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
Gilmour, S. MacLean. *The Gospel According to Luke*. IB 8. Twenty-fourth Edition. Nashville: Abingdon, 1982 [1952].
Glasson, T. Francis. *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology: With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs*. London: SPCK, 1961.
Glombitza, Otto. "Der reiche Mann und der arme Lazarus Luk 16,19–31. Zur frage nach der Botschaft des Textes." *NovT* 12 (1970), 166–80.
Glucker, John. "Cicero's Philosophical Affiliations." Pp. 34–69 in John M. Dillon & Anthony A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
Goldingay, John. "Death and Afterlife in the Psalms." Pp. 61–85 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Goodacre, Mark S. *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. JSNTSup 133. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
Goulder, Michael D. "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels." *JTS* 19 (1968), 51–69.
——. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
——. "Is Q a Jaggernaut?" *JBL* 115 (1996), 667–81.
Gowan, Donald E. *Eschatology in the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987.
Grabbe, Lester L. "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus." Pp. 163–85 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
——. "Introduction and Overview." Pp. 2–43 in Lester L. Grabbe & Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationship*. JSPSup. 46. London & New York: T & T Clark, 2003.
——. "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking." Pp. 107–33 in Lester L. Grabbe & Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and Their Relationship*. JSPSup. 46. London & New York: T & T Clark, 2003.
Graf, Fritz. *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 33. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
——. "Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology: New Texts and Old Questions." Pp. 239–58 in Thomas H. Carpenter & Christopher A. Faraone (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus*. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca, N.Y. & London: Cornell University Press, 1993.
Green, Joel. B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eermans, 1997.
——. "'Bodies—That Is, Human Lives': A Re-Examination of Human Nature in the Bible." Pp. 149–73 in Warren S. Brown & Nancey Murphy & H. Newton Malony (eds.), *Whatever happened to the Soul? Scientific and Theological Portraits of Human Nature*. Theology and the Sciences. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
Grensted, L.W. "The Use of Enoch in St. Luke xvi. 19–31." *ExpTim* 26 (1914–15), 333–34.
Gressmann, Hugo. *Vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus: eine literargeschichtliche Studie*. Abhandlungen der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philoso-

phisch-historische Klasse 1918, no. 7. Berlin: Verlag der königlich Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1918.
Griffiths, J. Gwyn. *The Divine Verdict: A Study of Divine Judgment in the Ancient Religions*. SHR 52. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
——. "Cross-Cultural Eschatology with Dives and Lazarus." *ExpTim* 105 (1993–94), 7–12.
Grobel, Kendrick. ". . . Whose Name Was Neves." *NTS* 10 (1963–64), 373–82.
Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
Grundmann, Walter & Gerhard von Rad & Gerhard Kittel. "ἄγγελος κτλ." *TWNT 1*, 72–87. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
Guthrie, W.K.C. *The Greeks and Their Gods*. Second Edition. Boston: Beacon, 1954.
Güttgemanns, Erhardt. "Narrative Analyse synoptischer Texte." *LB* 25/26 (1973), 50–73.
Hachlili, Rachel & Ann Killebrew. "Jewish Funerary Customs during the Second Temple Period, in the Light of the Excavations at the Jericho Necropolis." *PEQ* 115 (1983), 109–39.
Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982.
Hakola, Raimo. *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*. NovTSup 118. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
Halliwell, S. "Introduction." In Plato, *Republic 10*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988.
Halpern, Baruch. "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century B.C.E.: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability," Pp. 11–107 in Baruch Halpern & Deborah W. Hobson (eds.), *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*. JSOTSup 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Hansen, G. Walter. *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*. JSNTSup 29. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
Hanson, Paul D. "Apocalypticism." *IDBSup*, 28–34. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
Harder, Günther. "φθείρω κτλ." *TWNT 9*, 94–106. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1973.
Harlow, Daniel C. *The Greek* Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) *in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. SVTP 12. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Harrington, Daniel J. "Abraham Traditions in the Testament of Abraham and in the "Rewritten Bible" of the Intertestamental Period." Pp. 165–71 in George W.E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press, 1989.
Harrison, Jane Ellen. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.
Hasel, Gerhard F. "Resurrection in the Theology of Old Testament Apocalyptic." *ZAW* 92 (1980), 267–84.
Haufe, Günter. "Individuelle Eschatologie des Neuen Testaments." *ZTK* 83 (1986), 436–63.
Heinrichs, Albert. "Changing Dionysiac Identities." Pp. 137–60 in Ben F. Meyer & E.P. Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 3: Self-Definiton in the Graeco-Roman World*. London: SCM Press, 1982.
Hendriksen, William. *Exposition of the Gospel According to Luke*. New Testament Commentary. Third Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983.
Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Vol. 1: Text. Vol. 2: Notes & Bibliography. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
Henten, Jan Willem van. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. JSJSup 57. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Hershbell, Jackson P. "Introduction." Pp. 1–21 in Pseudo-Plato, *Axiochus*. SBLTT 21. Graeco-Roman Religion Series 6. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
Herzog, William R., II. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
Hiers, Richard H. "Friends by Unrighteous Mammon: The Eschatological Proletariat (Luke 16:9)." *JAAR* 38 (1970), 30–36.
——. "Day of Judgment." *ABD 2*, 79–82. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Hilhorst, A. "A Visit to Paradise: *Apocalypse of Paul* 45 and Its Background." Pp. 128–39 in Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Hill, David. "The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke 4,16–30)." *NovT* 13 (1971), 161–80.
Himmelfarb, Martha. *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
——. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
Hintzen, Johannes. *Verkündigung und Wahrnehmung: Über das Verhältnis von Evangelium und Leser am Beispiel Lk 16,19–31 im Rahmen des lukanischen Doppelwerkes*. BBB 81. Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1991.
Hock, Ronald F. "Lazarus and Micyllus: Greco-Roman Backgrounds to Luke 16,19–31." *JBL* 106 (1987), 447–63.
Hollander, H.W. & Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
Holleman, Joost. *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15*. NovTSup 84. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Holloway, Paul A. *Consolation in Philippians: Philosophical Sources and Rhetorical Strategy*. MSSNTS 112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
Horst, Pieter W. van der. *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An Introductory Survey of a Millenium of Jewish Funerary Epigraphy (300 B.C.E.–700 C.E.)*. CBET 2. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1991.
——. "Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti." *ABD 1*, 1157–61. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Hultgård, Anders. "Persian Apocalypticism." Pp. 39–83 in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Vol. 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity. New York & London: Continuum, 2000.
Ireland, Dennis J. *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God: An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16:1–13*. NovTSup 70. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
Jacobs, Louis. "Jewish Cosmology." Pp. 66–86 in Carmen Blacker & Michael Loewe (eds.), *Ancient Cosmologies*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1975.
Janko, Richard. "Forgetfulness in the Golden Tablets of Memory." *CQ* 34 (1984), 89–100.
Jensen, Hans Jørgen Lundager. "Diesseits und Jenseits des Raumes eines Textes." *LB* 47 (1980), 39–60.
Jeremias, Joachim. "ἄβυσσος." *TWNT 1*, 9. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
——. "ᾅδης." *TWNT 1*, 146–50. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
——. "γέεννα." *TWNT 1*, 655–56. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
——. "παράδεισος." *TWNT 5*, 763–71. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954.
——. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. KEK Sonderband. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
——. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu*. Tenth Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984. [ET: *The Parables of Jesus*. Second Revised Edition. Trans. S.H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.]

Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.

Johnson, David M. "Hesiod's descriptions of Tartarus (*Theogony* 721–819)." *Phoenix* 53 (1999), 8–27.

Johnson, Luke T. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS 39. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Johnston, Sarah Iles. *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Erster Teil: Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im allgemeinen. Zweite, neu bearbeitete Auflage. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten Evangelien. Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1899.

Kant, Laurence H. "Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin." *ANRW 2.20.2*, 671–706. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.

Käsemann, Ernst. "Die Anfänge der christlichen Thelogie." Pp. 82–104 in Ernst Käsemann, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen 2*. Second Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

Kazantzakis, Nikos. *The Last Temptation of Christ*. Trans. P.A. Bien. Fifth Edition. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1960.

Kelber, Werner H. *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

——. "Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space." *Semeia* 65 (1994), 139–67.

Kiilunen, Jarmo. "Sanoma kääntymyksestä—Luukkaan toimintaohjelma kirkolle." [The Message of Repentance.—Luke's Program for the Church.] Pp. 103–24 in L. Aejmelaeus (ed.), *Aimo annos eksegetiikkaa*. FS Aimo T. Nikolainen. Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 1992.

Kingsley, Peter. *Ancient Philosophy, Mystery, and Magic: Empedocles and Pythagorean Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Kloppenborg, John S. "The Dishonoured Master (Luke 16,1–8a)." *Bib* 70 (1989), 474–95.

Kloppenborg Verbin John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.

Klostermann, Erich. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 5. Second Revised Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929.

Knauer, Georg Nicolaus. "Vergil and Homer." *ANRW 2.31.2*, 870–918. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1981.

Knibb, Michael A. "Commentary on 2 Esdras." In R.J. Coggins & M.A. Knibb, *The First and Second Books of Esdras*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Knox, Wilfred L. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels 2: St. Luke and St. Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham. "The Genre Testament of the Testament of Abraham." Pp. 139–52 in George W.E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.

——. "The Angelology of the Testament of Abraham." George W.E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.

Kremer, Jacob. *Lukasevangelium*. NEchtB 3. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1988.

Kreitzer, Larry. "Luke 16:19–31." *ExpTim* 103 (1991–92), 139–42.

Kurtz, Donna C. & John Broadman. *Greek Burial Customs*. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life. London: Thames & Hudson, 1971.

Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic I: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

Lang, Bernhard. "Street Theater, Raising the Dead, and the Zoroastrian Connection in Ezekiel's Prophecy." Pp. 297–316 in Johan Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and* Literary Criticism and Their Interpretation. BETL 74. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.

Lang, Friedrich. "πῦρ κτλ." *TWNT 6*, 927–53. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1959.

Lapinkivi, Pirjo. *The Sumerian Sacred Marriage in the Light of Comparative Evidence*. SAAS 15. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2004.

Lattimore, Richmond. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 28. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1942.

Leaney, A.R.C. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958.

LeGoff, Jacques. *La naissance du purgatoire*. Bibliothèque des histoires. Paris: Gallimard, 1981.

Lehtipuu, Outi. "Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and the Poor Man in Luke 16.19–31." Pp. 73–105 in David Rhoads & Kari Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

——. "The Imagery of the Lukan Afterworld in the Light of Some Roman and Greek Parallels." Pp. 133–46 in Michael Labahn & Jürgen Zangenberg (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen: Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten* Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies. TANZ 36. Tübingen & Basel: Francke, 2002.

Lewis, T.J. *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*. HSM 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Lindgård, Fredrik. *Paul's Line of Thought in 2 Corinthians 4:16–5:10*. WUNT 2,189. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. 2005.

Linforth, Ivan M. *The Arts of Orpheus*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1941.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. "Pindar and the After-Life." Pp. 245–283 in D.E. Gerber et al. (eds.), *Pindare: huit exposés suivit de discussion: Vandoeuvres-Genève 21–26 août 1984*. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 31. Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1985.

Lohfink, Gerhard. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*. SANT 24. München: Kösel, 1971.

Long, Anthony A. "Soul and Body in Stoicism." *Phronesis* 27 (1982), 34–57.

Mach, Michael. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven, CT & London: Yale University Press, 1981.

Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. FRLANT 126. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament." *ANRW 2.26.1*, 267–333. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

Malten, Ludolf. "Ῥαδάμανθυς." *PW 1 A*, 31–35. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1920.

Mann, C.S. "Unjust Steward or Prudent Manager?" *ExpTim* 102 (1990–91), 234–35.

Mansfeld, Jaap. "Philosophy in the Service of Scripture: Philo's Exegetical Strategies." Pp. 70–102 in John M. Dillon & Anthony A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Manson, Thomas Walter. *The Sayings of Jesus: As Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Arranged with Introduction and Commentary. London: SCM Press, 1949.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary*. NIGTC. Second Edition. Exeter: Paternoster & Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989 [1978].

Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT & London: Yale University Press, 1995.
——. *Inventing Superstition: from the Hippocratics to the Christians*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
Martin, Hubert Jr. & Jane E. Phillips. "Consolatio ad uxorem (Moralia 608A–612B)." Pp. 394–441 in Hans Dieter Betz (ed.), *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*. SCHNT 4. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
Matthews, Christopher R. "*Apocryphal* Intertextual *Act*ivities: A Response to Harold W. Attridge's 'Intertextuality in the Acts of Thomas.'" *Semeia* 80 (1997), 125–35.
Mattill, A.J. Jr. *Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought*. Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1979.
McDannell, Colleen & Bernhard Lang. *Heaven: A History*. New Haven, CT & London: Yale University Press, 1988.
Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, CT & London: Yale University Press, 1983.
Meier, John P. "The Debate on the Resurrection of the Dead: An Incident from the Ministry of the Historical Jesus?" *JSNT* 77 (2000), 3–24.
Meyer, Elizabeth A. "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs." *JRS* 80 (1990), 74–96.
Meyer, Rudolf. "κόλπος Ἀβραάμ." *TWNT 3*, 824–26. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.
Michaelis, Wilhelm. "σκήνη κτλ." *TWNT 7*, 369–96. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1964.
Milde, Henk. "'Going out into the Day': Ancient Egyptian Beliefs and Practices concerning Death." Pp. 15–34 in Jan Maarten Bremer, Theo P.J. van den Hout & Rudolph Peters (eds.), *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994.
Milik, Józef T. "Problèmes de la literature Hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân." *HTR* 64 (1971), 333–78.
Milikowski, Chaim. "Which Gehenna? Retribution and Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels and in Early Jewish Texts." *NTS* 34 (1988), 238–49.
Motto, Anna Lydia. *Seneca Sourcebook: Guide to the Thought of Lucius Annaeus Seneca. In the extant prose works—Epistulae Morales, the Dialogi, De Beneficiis, De Clementia, and Quaestiones Naturalee*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1970.
Müller, Hans-Peter. "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik." Pp. 268–93 in *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971*. VTSup 22. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
Murphy, Roland E. "Death and Afterlife in Wisdom Literature." Pp. 101–16 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: *Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Myers, Jacob M. *I and II Esdras*. AB 42. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974.
Mylonas, George E. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961.
Nave, Guy D. Jr. *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*. SBL Academia Biblica 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
Navia, Luis E. *Pythagoras: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York & London: Garland, 1990.
Neale, David A. *None but the Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke*. JSNTSup 58. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Neusner, Jacob. "Introduction. The Four Approaches to the Description of Ancient Judaism(s): Nominalist, Harmonistic, Theological, and Historical." Pp. 1–31 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life*

*after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Newsom, Carol A. & Duane F. Watson. "Angels." *ABD 1*, 248–55. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Nickelsburg, George W.E. Jr. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. HTS 26. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press & London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
——. "Eschatology in the Testament of Abraham: A Study of the Judgment Scene in the Two Recensions." Pp. 23–64 in George W.E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
——. "Structure and Message in the Testament of Abraham." Pp. 85–93 in George W.E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
——. "The Apocalyptic Message of *1 Enoch* 92–105." *CBQ* 39 (1977), 309–28.
——. "Riches, the Rich and God's Judgement in *1 Enoch* 92–105 and the Gospel According to Luke." *NTS* 25 (1979), 324–44.
——. "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times." Pp. 33–87 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
——. "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." Pp. 89–156 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
——. "Judgment, Life-after-Death, and Resurrection in the Apocrypha and the Non-Apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha." Pp. 141–62 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
——. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
——. "Revisiting the Rich and the Poor in *1 Enoch* 92–105 and the Gospel According to Luke." Pp. 547–71 in Jacob Neusner & Alan J. Avery-Peck (eds.), *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning 2*. JSJSup 80. Leiden: Brill, 2003. [Reprint of "Revisiting the Rich and the Poor in *1 Enoch* 92–105 and the Gospel According to Luke." Pp. 579–605 in *SBL Seminar Papers 37*. Vol. 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.]
Nielsen, Anders E. *Until It Is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology According to Luke 22 and Acts 20*. WUNT 2,126. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
Nikolainen, Aimo T. *Luukkaan evankeliumi*. [The Gospel According to Luke.] SUTS 3. Third Edition. Hämeenlinna: Kirjapaja, 1980.
Nilsson, Martin P. "Early Orphism and Kindred Movements." *HTR* 28 (1935), 181–230.
——. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 2 vols. Second Edition. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5.2.1–2. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1961.
Obermüller, Rodolfo. "La miseria de un rico: Un juicio neotestamentario—Lucas 16,19–31." Pp. 45–66 in J. Severino Croatto, Hans-Hartmut Schroeder et al. (eds.), *Les pobres: Encuentro y compromiso*. Buenos Aires: La Aurora, 1978.
Oepke, Albrecht "ἀπόλλυμι κτλ." *TWNT 1*, 393–96. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
Olyan, Saul M. *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism*. TSAJ 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. Fifth Edition. London & New York: Routledge, 1991 [1982].

Paffenroth, Kim. *The Story of Jesus According to L.* JSNTSup 147. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
Park, Joseph S. *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions: With Special Reference to Pauline Literature.* WUNT 2/121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
Parker, Robert. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.
——. "Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology." Pp. 143–60 in Christopher Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
Parrott, Douglas M. "The Dishonest Steward (Luke 16.1–8a) and Luke's Special Parable Collection." *NTS* 37 (1991), 499–515.
Peres, Imre. *Griechische Grabinschriften und neutestamentliche Eschatologie.* WUNT 157. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
Perkins, Pheme. *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection.* London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984.
Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* London: SPCK, 1970.
Pieper, Max. "Zum Setna-Roman." *ZÄS* 67 (1931), 71–74.
Pietersma, Albert. *The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres the Magicians.* P. Chester Beatty XVI (with New Editions of Papyrus Vindobonensis Greek inv. 29456 + 29828 verso and British Library Cotton Tiberius B. V.f. 87). Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 119. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Piper, Ronald A. "Social Background and Thematic Structure in Luke 16." Pp. 1637–62 in F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle & J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992.* FS Frans Neirynck. BETL 100, II. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
Plümacher, Eckhard. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte.* SUNT 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
Plummer, Alfred. *The Gospel According to S. Luke.* ICC. Fifth Edition. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981 [1896].
Pokorný, Petr. "Lukas 15,11–32 und die lukanische Soteriologie." Pp. 179–92 in Karl Kertelge, Traugott Holtz & Claus-Peter März (eds.), *Christus bezeugen.* FS Wolfgang Trilling. ETS 59. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1989.
Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. "When the Gods are Speaking: Toward Defining the Interface between Polytheism and Monotheism." Pp. 132–68 in Matthias Köckert & Martti Nissinen (eds.), *Propheten in Mari, Assyrien und Israel.* FRLANT 201. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
Poortman, Bartel. "Death and Immortality in Greek Philosophy: From the Presocratics to the Hellenistic Era." Pp. 197–220 in Jan Maarten Bremer, Theo P.J. van den Hout & Rudolph Peters (eds.), *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994.
Porter, Stanley E. "The Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16.1–13): Irony *Is* the Key." Pp. 127–53 in David J.A. Clines, Stephen E. Fowl & Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield.* JSOTSup 87. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
Powell, J.G.F. "Introduction." In Cicero, *Laelius on Friendship & The Dream of Scipio.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1990.
Powyss, David. *"Hell": A Hard Look at a Hard Question: The Fate of the Unrighteous in New Testament Thought.* Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
Puech, Émile. "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1 QH)." *JJS* (1988), 38–55.
——. *La croyance des esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien I: La résurrection des morts et le contexte scripturaire.* EBib, Nouvelle série 21. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.

Rad, Gerhard von. *Theologie des Alten Testaments 2: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels*. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1960.
Räisänen, Heikki. "The Prodigal Gentile and His Jewish Christian Brother Lk 15,11–32." Pp. 1617–36 in F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle & J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*. FS Frans Neirynck. BETL 100, II. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
Reddish, Mitchell G. "Heaven." *ABD 3*, 90–91. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Rehkopf, Friedrich. *Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959.
Reinmuth, Eckart. "Ps.-Philo, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 33,1–5 und die Auslegung der Parabel Lk 16:19–31." *NovT* 31 (1989), 16–38.
Richardson, N.J. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.
——. "Early Greek Views about Life after Death." Pp. 50–66 in P.E. Easterling & J.V. Muir (eds.), *Greek Religion and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
Riedweg, Christoph. "Initiation—Tod—Unterwelt: Beobachtungen zur Kommunikations-situation und narrativen Technik der orphisch-bakchischen Goldblättchen." Pp. 359–98 in Fritz Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert*. Stuttgart & Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1998.
Ries, Julien. "Immortality." Pp. 246–80 in Lawrence E. Sullivan (ed.), *Death, Afterlife, and the Soul*. Religion, History, and Culture: Selections from *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: MacMillan, 1989.
Riley, Gregory J. *Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
Robbins, Vernon K. "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response." *Semeia* 65 (1994), 75–91.
——. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.
Robinson, James M. "Introduction: The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship." Pp. 1–19 in James M. Robinson & Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
Rohde, Erwin. *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*. 2 vols. Fifth and Sixth Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1910.
Rohde, Joachim. *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. Trans. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press, 1968.
Roig Lanzallotta, Lautaro. "Does Punishment Reward the Righteous? The Justice Pattern Underlying the Apocalypse of Peter." Pp. 127–57 in Jan N. Bremmer & István Czachesz (eds.), *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha 7. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
Rudhardt, Jean. "Concerning the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*." Pp. 198–211 in Helene P. Foley (ed.), *The Homeric* Hymn to Demeter*: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretative Essays*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
Rudolph, Kurt. "Apokalyptik in der Diskussion." Pp. 771–89 in David Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalyptism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Preceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalyptism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M. van. "Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in the *Book of Jubilees*." Pp. 63–94 in Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of* Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity. Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
Russell, D.A. *Plutarch*. London: Duckworth, 1973.

Russell, David S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200 B.C.–A.D. 100*. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1964.
Rutgers, Leonard V. "Death and Afterlife: The Inscriptional Evidence." Pp. 293–310 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Sahlin, Harald. "Lasarus-gestalten i Luk 16 och Joh 11." *SEÅ* 37–38 (1972–73), 167–74.
Saller, Richard P. & Brent D. Shaw. "Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers and Slaves." *JRS* 74 (1984), 124–56.
Salo, Kalervo. *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation*. AASF Diss. 57. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1991.
Sanders, Ed Parish. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 B.C.E.–66 C.E.* Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992.
——. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin Press, 1993.
Sanders, E.P. & Margaret Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM Press & Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989.
Sanders, Gabriel. *Lapides memores: Païens et chrétiens face à la mort: le témoignage de l'épigraphie funéraire latine*. Eds. Angela Donati, Dorothy Pikhuis & Marc van Uytfanghe. Epigrafia e antichità 11. Faenza: Fratelli Lega, 1991.
Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press, 1987.
——. "The Criterion of Coherence and the Randomness of Charisma: Poring through Some Aporias in the Jesus Tradition." *NTS* 44 (1998), 1–25.
Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81 (1962), 1–13.
——. *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*. New York: KTAV, 1971 [1956].
Schmithals, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. ZBK 3. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980.
Schmidt, Brian B. *Israel's Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*. FAT 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
——. "Memory as Immortality: Countering the Dreaded 'Death after Death' in Ancient Israelite Society." Pp. 87–100 in Alan J. Avery-Peck & Jacob Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity 4: Death, Life after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. HO 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 49. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Das Johannesevangelium 2*. HTKNT. Fourth Edition. Freiburg: Herder, 1985.
Schneider, Gerhard. *Parusiegleichnisse im Lukas-Evangelium*. SBS 74. Stuttgart: KBW, 1975.
——. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. ÖTK 3/2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn & Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977.
——. *Die Apostelgeschichte I*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
Schnider, F. & W. Stenger. "Die offene Tür und die unüberschreitbare Kluft: Strukturanalytische Überlegungen zum Gleichnis vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus (Lk 16,19–31)." *NTS* 25 (1979), 273–83.
Schweitzer, Albert. *Zwischen Wasser und Urwald: Erlebnisse und Beobachtungen eines Arztes im Urwalde Äquatorialafrikas*. Bern: Paul Haupt & Konstanz: Richard Walther, 1923.
——. *Denken und Tat*. Collected and presented by Rudolf Grabs. Hamburg: Richard Meirer, 1952.
Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. NTD 3. Eighteenth Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
Scott, Alan. *Origen and the Life of Stars: A History of an Idea*. The Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Scott, Bernard Brandon. "A Master's Praise. Luke 16,1–8a." *Bib* 64 (1983), 173–88.
——. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
——. "Blowing in the Wind: A Response." *Semeia* 65 (1994), 181–91.
Scurlock, JoAnn. "Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Mesopotamian Thought." Pp. 1883–93 in Jack Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East, 3*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995.
Seccombe, David Peter. *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. SNTSU B/6. Linz: Fuchs, 1982.
Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
Segal, Alan F. *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West*. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
Segal, Charles. "Dionysus and the Gold Tablets from Pelinna." *GRBS* (1990), 411–19.
Sellin, Gerhard. "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherziger Samariter." *ZNW* 65 (1974), 166–89; 66 (1975), 19–60.
Shaked, Shaul. "Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E." Pp. 308–25 in W.D. Davies & Louis Finkelstein (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol. 1: Introduction; the Persian Period. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
Siker, Jeffrey S. "First to the Gentiles: A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16–30." *JBL* 111 (1992), 73–90.
Smith, Dennis E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 104 (1987), 613–38.
Smith, Jonathan Z. "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity." *ANRW 2.16.1*, 425–39. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
——. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. JLCRS 14. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1990.
Smith, Morton. "De Superstitione (Moralia 164E–171F)." Pp. 1–35 in Hans Dieter Betz (ed.), *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature*. SCHNT 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
Snyder, Graydon F. *Ante Pacem: Archeological Evidence of Church Life before Constantine*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
Souilhé, Joseph. "Notice." Pp. 117–36 in *Platon: Ouvres completes* 13/3. Collection des Universités de France. Paris: Sociéte d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1930.
Sourvinou-Inwood, Christine. "A Trauma in Flux: Death in the 8th Century and After." Pp. 33–48 in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation*. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 1–5 June 1981. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athens, 1983.
——. "Crime and Punishment: Tityos, Tantalos and Sisyphos in *Odyssey* 11." *BICS* 33 (1986), 37–58.
——. *"Reading" Greek Death: To the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
——. "Tragedy and Religion: Constructs and Readings." Pp. 161–86 in Christopher Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
Spencer, Alan Jeffrey. *Death in Ancient Egypt*. Second Edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.
Spronk, Klaas. *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. AOAT 219. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986.
Standen, A.O. "The Parable of Dives and Lazarus and Enoch 22." *ExpTim* 33 (1921–22), 523.
Stein, Arthur. "Hermes." *PW 8*, 738–92. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1913.

Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. NAC 24. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.
Stemberger, Günter. *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr.–100 n. Chr.)* AnBib 56. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972.
Stevens, Susan T. "Charon's Obol and Other Coins in Ancient Funerary Practice." *Phoenix* 45 (1991), 215–29.
Stock-Hesketh, Jonathan. "Circles and Mirrors: Understanding *1 Enoch* 21–32." *JSP* 21 (2000), 27–58.
Stone, Michael Edward. "Apocalyptic Literature." Pp. 383–441 in Michael E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2/2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
——. *Features of the Eschatology of IV Ezra*. HSS 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
——. *Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
——. "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." Pp. 184–97 in Michael E. Stone, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha: With Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition*. SVTP 9. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
——. "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'the End' in 4 Ezra." Pp. 333–47 in Michael E. Stone, *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha: With Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition*. SVTP 9. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
Stoops, Robert F., Jr. "Introduction: Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Intertextual Perspectives." *Semeia* 80 (1997), 1–10.
Strack, Hermann L. & Paul Billerbeck. *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte erläutet aus Talmud und Midrasch 2*. Eighth Edition. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1983 [1924].
Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels*. London: Macmillan, 1924.
Swain, Simon. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World A.D. 50–250*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
Syreeni, Kari. *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount: A Procedural Analysis of Matthew's Redactional Activity*. I: Methodology & Compositional Analysis. AASF Diss. 44. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1987.
——. "Matthew, Luke and the Law: A Study in Hermeneutical Exegesis." Pp. 126–55 in Timo Veijola (ed.), *The Law in the Bible and its Environments*. SFTL 51. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht & Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 1990.
——. "The Gospel in Paradigms: A Study in the Hermeneutical Space of Luke-Acts." Pp. 36–57 in Petri Luomanen (ed.), *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. SFTL. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht & Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 1991.
Tabor, James D. *Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Paradise in its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986.
——. "Heaven, Ascent to." *ABD 3*, 91–94. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
Taeger, Jens-Wilhelm. *Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas*. SNT 14. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1982.
Tanghe, Vincent. "Abraham, son fils et son envoyé (Luc 16,19–31)." *RB 91* (1984), 557–77.
Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation 1: The Gospel According to Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
Thompson, Alden Lloyd. *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra: A Study Illustrating the Significance of Form and Structure for the Meaning of the Book*. SBLDS 29. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (*1 Enoch* and Other Texts Found at Qumran.)" Pp. 37–62 in Gerard P. Luttikhuizen (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Themes in Biblical Narrative: Jewish and Christian Traditions 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Tuckett, Christopher M. *Reading the New Testament: Methods of Interpretation*. London: SPCK, 1987.

——. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Second Edition. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.

Uchelen, Nico van. "Death and After-life in the Hebrew Bible of Ancient Israel." Pp. 77–90 in Jan Maarten Bremer, Theo P.J. van den Hout & Rudolph Peters (eds.), *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994.

Uro, Risto. *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2003.

Valantasis, Richard. "The Nuptial Chamber Revisited: The *Acts of Thomas* and Cultural Intertextuality." *Semeia* 97 (1980), 261–76.

VanderKam, James C. "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought." Pp. 241–54 in James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000. [Reprint of "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought." Pp. 163–76 in James D. Martin & Philip R. Davies (eds.), *A Word in Season: Essays in Honor of William McKane*. JSOTSup. 42. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1986.]

——. "Prophecy and Apocalyptics in the Ancient Near East." Pp. 255–75 in James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000. [Reprint of "Prophecy and Apocalyptics in the Ancient Near East." Pp. 2083–94 in Jack Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East 3*. New York: Scribners, 1995.]

VanderKam, James & Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 2002.

Vawter, Bruce. "Intimations of Immortality and the Old Testament." *JBL* 91 (1972), 158–71.

Via, Dan Otto. *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

Wacker, Marie-Theres. *Weltordnung und Gericht: Studien zu 1 Henoch 22*. FB 45. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982.

Ward, Roy Bowen. "Abraham Traditions in Early Christianity." Pp. 173–84 in George W.E. Nickelsburg (ed.), *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. SBLSCS 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.

Watson, Duane E. "Gehenna." *ABD 2*, 926–28. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Wehrli, Eugene S. "Luke 16,19–31." *Int* 31 (1977), 276–80.

Wehrli, Fritz. "Herakleides Pontikos." *PWSup 11*, 675–86.

West, M.L. "Zum neuen Goldblättchen aus Hipponion." *ZPE* 18 (1975), 229–36.

——. "The Orphics of Olbia." *ZPE* 45 (1982), 17–29.

——. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

Wiefel, Wolfgang. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. THKNT 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1988.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich von. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. Band II. Berlin: Weidmann, 1932.

Willcock, M.M. *Pindar Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Williams, Francis E. "Is Almsgiving the Point of the 'Unjust Steward?'" *JBL* 84 (1964), 293–97.
Wilson, Stephen G. "Lukan Eschatology." *NTS* 15 (1969), 330–47.
——. *Luke and the Law*. MSSNTS 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. AB 43. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.
Woodhead, A.G. *The Study of Greek Inscriptions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
Wright, Nicholas T. *Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God, Vol. 2*. Minneapolis: Fortress & London SPCK, 1996.
Yarbro Collins, Adela. "Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature." *ANRW 2.21.2*, 1221–87. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
——. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. JSJSup 50. Leiden: Brill. 1996.
York, John O. *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*. JSNTSup 46. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
Zandee, Jan. *Death as an Enemy: According to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions*. Studies in the History of Religions. SHR 5. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
Zuntz, Günther. *Persephone: Three Essays on Religion and Thought in Magna Graecia*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

# INDEX OF PASSAGES

## The Hebrew Bible

## The New Testament

## The Apocrypha & the Pseudepigrapha

## Dead Sea Scrolls



## Hellenistic Jewish Authors

## Rabbinic Sources



## Christian Sources

## Classical Sources

# GENERAL INDEX